

Gatekeeping at work

the establishment, negotiation and assessment of nationality, language and religion in internship interviews

Tranekjær, Louise

Publication date:
2009

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (APA):
Tranekjær, L. (2009). *Gatekeeping at work: the establishment, negotiation and assessment of nationality, language and religion in internship interviews*. Roskilde Universitet.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact rucforsk@kb.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 THE STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS	3
1.2 LEARNING AND INTEGRATION – A RESEARCH PROJECT ON LINGUISTIC, CULTURAL AND SOCIAL PROCESSES OF CHANGE AMONG IMMIGRANTS AND REFUGEES	4
1.3 THE DATA: RECORDING, TRANSCRIBING AND SELECTING	6
1.3.1 OVERVIEW OF DATA	8
1.4 METHODOLOGICAL POSITIONING	11
 CHAPTER 2: THE INTERNSHIP INTERVIEW AS A COMMUNICATIVE EVENT	 18
2.1 THE BROADER CONTEXT OF THE INTERNSHIP AND THE INTERNSHIP INTERVIEW	22
2.1.1 INTERNSHIPS AS AN EMPLOYMENT STRATEGY AND A GOVERNMENT INITIATIVE	24
2.1.2 THE SITUATION AND POSITION OF THE JOB CONSULTANT	28
2.1.3 THE SITUATION AND POSITION OF THE EMPLOYERS	34
2.1.4 THE SITUATION AND POSITION OF THE INTERNSHIP CANDIDATES	36
2.2 THE STRUCTURING OF THE INTERNSHIP INTERVIEW	42
2.2.1 THE PARTICIPATION FRAMEWORK	43
2.2.2 THE SPEECH SITUATION (THE SETTING)	65
2.2.3 INSTITUTIONAL SPEECH EVENTS	89
2.2.4 THE CONSTRUCTION AND NEGOTIATION OF ASYMMETRIES	103
2.2.5 SITUATIONAL ASYMMETRIES, DISCOURSE ASYMMETRIES AND TRANSPORTABLE ASYMMETRIES	106
2.3 A GATEKEEPING SITUATION	112
2.3.1 THE INITIAL STUDIES OF GATEKEEPING	116
2.3.2 GATEKEEPING IN INTERACTIONAL SOCIOLINGUISTICS	119
2.3.3 RELATED STUDIES OF INTER-GROUP ‘GATEKEEPING ENCOUNTERS’	124
2.3.4 CA APPROACHES TO INTER-GROUP ‘GATEKEEPING ENCOUNTERS’	127
2.3.5 GATEKEEPING AS AN INTERACTIONAL AND IDEOLOGICAL PROCESS	128
 CHAPTER 3: CATEGORIES IN INTERACTION – AN INTERACTIONAL APPROACH TO THE KNOWLEDGE AND SOCIAL ORGANIZATION OF INDIVIDUALS	 132

3.1	DISCURSIVE PSYCHOLOGY	133
3.1.1	INTERPRETATIVE REPERTOIRES	135
3.1.2	PROCESSES OF CATEGORIZATION	139
3.2	ETHNOMETHODOLOGY AND CONVERSATION ANALYSIS	140
3.2.1	INDEXICALITY	141
3.2.2	SEQUENTIALITY	142
3.2.3	MEMBERSHIP CATEGORIZATION DEVICES	144
3.3	COMBINING PERSPECTIVES OF DP AND CA	147
3.3.1	CRITICAL ANALYSIS AND ‘UNMOTIVATED’ LOOKING	149
3.3.2	CATEGORIZATION, COMMON SENSE AND IDEOLOGY	165
CHAPTER 4:	CULTURE AND LANGUAGE	175
4.1	CULTURE AS SHAREDNESS AND RESOURCE	176
4.2	CULTURE AS STRATEGY OR PRODUCT	181
4.3	CULTURAL DIFFERENCE AND DIFFERENTIATION	186
4.3.1	INTER-ACTED AND INTER-RELATED COMMUNITIES	187
4.4	CULTURE AND LANGUAGE	188
4.4.1	CULTURE AS COMMUNITIES OF MEANING	190
4.4.2	A SOCIOLINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE ON LANGUAGE	191
4.4.3	A POSTSTRUCTURALIST PERSPECTIVE ON DISCOURSE	196
4.4.4	SPEECH COMMUNITIES	202
4.4.5	COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE	205
4.4.6	A HISTORIC-DIALECTIC PERSPECTIVE ON LANGUAGE	209
4.4.7	AN IDEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE ON LANGUAGE	215
4.5	CULTURE AS A FLEXIBLE COMMUNITY OF MEANING	218
4.6	METHODOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS	224
CHAPTER 5:	GATE-KEEPING IN INTERNSHIP INTERVIEWS – THE ESTABLISHMEN, NEGOTIATION AND ASSESSMENT OF NATIONALITY, RELIGION AND LANGUAGE	225
5.1	TWO ANALYTICAL PERSPECTIVES: MEMBERSHIP CATEGORIZATIONS AND INTERPRETATIVE REPERTOIRES	225
5.2	INTRODUCTION TO THE ANALYSIS	229
5.3	HOW ARE CATEGORIES RELATED TO ‘NATIONALITY’ MADE RELEVANT?	234

5.3.1	INTERPRETATIVE REPERTOIRES ASSOCIATING ‘NATIONALITY’ WITH ‘CULTURE’	251
5.3.2	SUMMARY	258
5.4	HOW ARE CATEGORIES RELATED TO ‘LANGUAGE’ MADE RELEVANT?	260
5.4.1	INTERPRETATIVE REPERTOIRES ASSOCIATING ‘LANGUAGE’ WITH ‘NATIONALITY’	277
5.4.2	SUMMARY	284
5.5	HOW ARE CATEGORIES RELATED TO RELIGION MADE RELEVANT?	288
5.5.1	INTERPRETATIVE REPERTOIRES ASSOCIATING ‘RELIGION’ WITH ‘CULTURE’	307
5.5.2	SUMMARY	311
5.6	GATEKEEPING IN INTERNSHIP INTERVIEWS – HOW THE NEGOTIATION, ESTABLISHMENT AND ASSESSMENT OF NATIONALITY, LANGUAGE AND RELIGION PRODUCES AN UNEVEN DISTRIBUTION OF RIGHTS, KNOWLEDGE AND STATUS BETWEEN THE PARTICIPANTS.	315
	CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION	322
	ENGLISH SUMMARY	326
	DANSK RESUMÉ	327
	APPENDIX 1: LEGAL EXTRACTS	328
	APPENDIX 2: TRANSCRIPTION NOTATIONS	331
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	332

Acknowledgements

Many people have contributed to the completion and result of this thesis and thanks are due. First and foremost I would like to thank my two supervisors Karen Risager and Susanne Kjærbeck for being supportive and encouraging with respect to my interdisciplinary and boundary stretching endeavour. Your individual capacities and perspectives inspired me to find my own theoretical and methodological bearings and your guidance helped solidify my ideas. Secondly I would like to pay tribute to the research group at the Department of Education and Professional Studies at King's College, who both hosted and boosted my research process. Your inclusive and rigorous research environment gave my work direction and depth. I would especially like to thank Celia Roberts, Ben Rampton and Roxy Harris for our inspiring and encouraging discussions that fuelled my critical research perspective and reminded me of the aim and purpose of my research. I would also like to express my gratitude to the research group behind the project Learning and Integration, who secured funding for my research and provided an amiable forum for presenting ideas, views, problems and frustrations. Thank you to Karen, Karen, Michael, Johannes, Rineke, Gitte, Kristian and not least Kirsten for making the journey a social and interactional process of learning. Finally I would like to thank the people close to me who have become involved and affected by this thesis and have been supportive and helpful along the way. Thanks to Susan for trawling through my errors and long sentences and to Katrine for graphic consultation. And above all, thank you Martin for providing endless encouragement, support and insightful feedback while keeping me focused, grounded and sane throughout the process.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Employment is officially formulated as one of the three overall goals of Danish integration policy for the integration of immigrants and refugees in Denmark along with the goal of education for bilingual children and a commonly shared set of democratic values¹.

Employment is described as a central element in the integration of refugees and immigrants and although this relation is not explicitly explained, it seems to be implied that integration presupposes self-sustenance and an equal participation in and contribution to the Danish labour market. While the issue of *integration* and the question of whether employment is conducive to its achievement can be discussed and contested², the overrepresentation of immigrants and refugees in unemployment figures cannot. In 2007, nearly 47 % of immigrants from non-western countries were registered as unemployed compared to around 21% unemployment among people of Danish origin (Danmarks Statistik 2007)³, which is the biggest difference registered in Europe.

Most born abroad⁴ immigrants find jobs through social networks or get jobs that require no formal application procedures (Hjarnø 1990:326) and a few use common strategies of employment such as written applications and regular job-interviews. Finally, many born abroad immigrants use the strategy of becoming self-employed by starting up small businesses within the food or retail industry (Rezaei 2005). Those that are unemployed are often placed in various job-counselling programmes by the municipality or the national job service, *Arbejdsformidlingen*, where they learn to write resumes, receive Danish lessons, receive professional training and not least are placed in *internships*. Thus, *internships* are an employment strategy, which is used to introduce people with particular occupational barriers to

¹ These goals are formulated on the official website published by the Ministry of refugees, immigrants and Integration. http://www.nyidanmark.dk/da-dk/Integration/regeringens_integrationspolitik/regeringens_integrationspolitik.htm

² I will not engage with the issue of integration in this thesis. For further discussion of the notion of integration and the Danish integration Policy see (Hamburger 1989; Hamburger 1990).

³ Danmarks Statistik (Statistics Denmark) define *immigrants* as people who are born abroad and where neither of the parents are Danish citizens and born in Denmark. The figure presented refers to immigrants from non-Western countries. *People of Danish origin* are defined regardless of place of birth by having at least one parent who is a Danish citizen and born in Denmark.

⁴ I use the term 'born abroad' to signify immigrants and refugees who are not born in Denmark, but have come here during their adulthood. It is a term used by Roberts and Campbell (Roberts & Campbell 2006) in their study of job-interviews in Britain.

the labour market and which, in the case of immigrants and refugees, is an integrated part of a more overall integrational strategy. The purpose of the internship is to bring the candidate one step closer to an ordinary related to either their skills, professional background or interest and perhaps continue working in the company on regular terms after the internship. Internships are an employment strategy that is commonly used for born abroad immigrants and it is a practice heavily supported legislatively and institutionally within the welfare system and the labour market.

The common procedure around the internship is that the candidate or the job consultant contacts an institution or a company and set up an interview for the candidate and the job consultant. This PhD thesis focuses on such *internship interviews* with born abroad immigrant candidates that are carried out as part of the planning and evaluation of the internships and investigate the processes of meaning and social organisation that they involve.

Very briefly put, the internship interview may be characterised as a decision-making and assessment encounter between an employer, a job consultant and an internship candidate as well as, at times, an employee. During these interviews the participants present themselves and the work-place and the conditions and tasks of the internships are decided and agreed upon.

This thesis examines the internship as a gatekeeping encounter where the participants negotiate and establish not only the future reality of the candidates but the membership categories that the internship candidates belong to. The phenomenon of gatekeeping in internship interviews will be examined from an interactional perspective, combining the methodology of conversation analysis with a discursive psychological perspective on broader structures of meaning. The overall question which will be addressed is:

How are membership categories related to nationality, language and religion established and negotiated in internship interviews, and how does this relate to the distribution of rights, knowledge and status between the participants?

First, this will be examined from a micro-analytical perspective by investigating *how the construction of membership categories related to nationality, language and religion within the various internship interviews interrelates with, and influences, the speech situation*. Through detailed micro-analysis of transcribed extracts from the recorded interviews, this question will shed light on the way cultural, linguistic and religious differences are locally constructed and made relevant to the activities taking place in the interaction and the way this influences the development of the interaction and the future possibilities of the candidate.

Second, a discursive psychological perspective will be explored in order to examine *how the various constructions of nationality, language and religion manifest patterns of meaning related to nationality, language and religion*. The local discursive and social practices in the internship interview influence and are influenced by widespread and common notions of culture, immigration and integration, which are manifested in the discursive and social practices around the establishment and organisation of the internship and the internship interview. In other words, the second question will explore the patterns of meaning and ideologies in relation to culture, integration and immigration that may be identified across the various interviews and will relate these to the discursive and social practices that constitute the broader legislative, administrative and organisational context of the internship interview and the internship. Such ideologies inform and influence processes of meaning and social organisation in and beyond the internship interviews and hereby they contribute to making the process of integration into the Danish labour market and Danish society as such more or less difficult. The examination of how broader structures of meaning and ideology manifest themselves in the discursive and social practice in and around the internship in this way raises some interesting questions about the problems and benefits of particular job-counselling and internships for people who are born abroad which will be ultimately addressed though not answered in this thesis.

1.1 The structure of the thesis

The thesis comprises six chapters. Chapter one presents the area and object of research as well as information and reflections about the data, the methodology and the methodological positioning forming the basis of the thesis. Chapter two comprises a presentation of the internship interview from two different perspectives, a description of the broader context in which the internship interview is embedded and an analysis of how the participants establish and orient to the internship interview as a particular communicative event. Central to this chapter is a discussion of the internship interview as a site of processes of Gatekeeping. Chapter three presents the theoretical and methodological approach to Membership Categories as an interactional means for the constitution and organisation of the social world. It furthermore contains a methodological discussion that describes my position with respect to the issue of ‘critical’ versus ‘unmotivated’ research. Chapter four contains a theoretical discussion of the notion of culture and language that informs the thesis and the methodological

implications of this. Chapter five presents the analytical framework as well as the actual analysis, which is divided into three sections focusing on categorizations related to nationality, language and religion respectively. Each section contains a microanalysis of membership categorization followed by a discursive psychological analysis of the interpretative repertoires that inform and influence this process. The analytical findings are concluded in a summary at the end of each section. Finally the chapter contains a section that discusses the analytical findings in relation to the processes of Gatekeeping. Chapter six presents my concluding remarks and reflections on the analytical and methodological propositions made in the thesis.

1.2 Learning and Integration – A Research Project on Linguistic, Cultural and Social Processes of Change among Immigrants and Refugees

The research presented in this thesis was funded by the Danish Research Council for the Humanities (DRCH) as part of a larger research project on Learning and Integration. The overall focus of this project was to gather a large corpus of various forms of data that would illuminate different aspects of linguistic, cultural and social processes of learning among immigrants and refugees in Denmark. Nine researchers are involved in this project⁵, three of which were on PhD scholarships.

The project gathered audio and video recordings and participant observation data from various language training programmes in the cities of Copenhagen, Roskilde, Odense and Svendborg. Furthermore, a total of 8 language learners were interviewed in Danish and in their mother tongue and some of these were equipped with hard-disk recorders that were used to record some of their daily interactions within and outside the language training facilities during the entire 4-year period of the project.

There were two different kinds of interviews being carried out: Biographic narrative interviews that were to elicit a narrative of the informant's linguistic and cultural experiences before and during their stay in Denmark. And secondly, interviews referred to as Culture interviews that were to illuminate the informants' impressions of, and experiences with, Danish language and culture.

⁵ These researchers are: Karen Risager, Michael Svendsen Pedersen and Louise Tranekjær from University of Roskilde, Catherine E. Rineke Brouwer, Gitte Rasmussen, Johannes Wagner and Kristian Mortensen from University of Southern Denmark and finally Karen Lund and Kirsten Lundgaard Kolstrup from University of Aarhus, School of Education.

The researchers within the research project had different theoretical orientations, methodological approaches and positions and used different data. However, there was a shared interest within the group in illuminating processes of cultural and linguistic integration and learning as well as a shared understanding of culture and language as intimately linked with social practice and interaction⁶.

The individual project summarized in the present thesis was independent of the majority of data collected within the overall research project, in the sense that the internship candidates participating in the recorded internship interviews were not the same as the informants followed in the research project as a whole. Nor were they currently involved in some of the language training courses studied by other researchers in the project. Originally, the intention was to illuminate linguistic and cultural processes of learning in relation to processes of employment and to relate the data collected to the findings generated from the study of institutional employment interviews. However, it so happened that those informants' who agreed to be involved in the research project on a long term basis and thereby supplying the main corpus of data were not unemployed. Therefore they were not suitable for my individual project of illuminating processes of language and culture related to job application interactions.

In this way I ended up collecting and using my own data involving sixteen immigrants and refugees with different nationalities and mother tongues, who were involved in a range of language and job training programmes different from the ones studied in the research programme as a whole. Consequently, my affiliation with the overall research project was defined by a shared theoretical and empirical interest in social interaction as the central site for cultural and linguistic processes of meaning and change and a sharing of perspectives and findings about such processes generated from different data types.

A major difference between the orientation of my research and that of the majority of the other researchers in the project is the lack of attention paid in my research to issues of learning, which was one of the central notions discussed and examined within the research project. Whereas the other researchers within the project examined whether verbal and social interaction could illuminate various aspects of processes of learning, I was more generally interested in studying social interaction as a site of production, negotiation and reproduction of meaning and ideologies and more specifically interested in processes of inclusion and

⁶ For further elaboration of the project see <http://www.dpu.dk/site.aspx?p=7434>. See also (Wagner 2006; Risager 2008; Risager forthcoming).

exclusion in relation to immigration and employment. Cultural and linguistic processes of learning are obviously intimately related with these issues and my affiliation with the research project Learning and Integration has illuminated the nature of this relation, although it has been too large a task to include and examine this perspective in my analysis and thesis. Such an endeavour would require additional time and funding.

1.3 The Data: Recording, Transcribing and Selecting

The data forming the basis of this thesis consist of 16 internship interviews audio-recorded in Copenhagen during the period of 2004-2007. The internship candidates participating in the interviews were involved in one of four different job-counselling programmes that were all aimed at unemployed adults that are born abroad and speak Danish as a second language. The duration of the interviews varied between approximately 30 to 90 minutes and they took place at the various work-places where the internships were supposed to take place. The different work-places involved were primarily residential homes and kindergartens but also included an orchard, a kitchen preparing food for the homeless, a school and a company offering home help services. Participating in the interviews were, besides the internship candidate, an employer at the given work-place, a job consultant involved in the job-programme or language programme of the internship candidate and, in some interviews, an employee responsible for or involved in the work-area that the internship candidate would be working in.

The **arrangement of the recordings** was facilitated by the various job consultants with whom I was in contact over the phone or had meetings with in order to explain my project and interests. My interests were during the time of data-collection very broad and expressed as such to the job consultants and the internship candidates. In some cases, I was able to participate in some of the training and counselling sessions prior to the internship interview and meet some of the participants that would potentially end up as candidates for an internship. Because of the amount of job- and language-programmes involved, it was however not possible for me to meet all of the participants prior to the interviews. Instead, I made arrangements with the job consultants that they would contact me, once an internship interview was set up. In most cases the job consultant had ask permission from the internship candidates for me to record and be present during the interview but in some cases, particularly in relation to one of the job consultants, the job consultant would simply introduce me to the candidate before the interview, and I would explain the project and ask their permission to record and participate. I was met with positive interest from all of the internship candidates, although

some expressed an almost embarrassed scepticism as to why I would find that interesting at all. In establishing the contact to the job consultants, I did however encounter some more reluctant cases, although the ones finally involved were very positive and helpful.

The process of **gaining access and permission** to record the interviews was far from ideal and in many ways chaotic and ad hoc. This was mainly due to the fragmented and dispersed organisation of job-counselling and language training in Denmark (see section 2.1.2) but another contributing factor was that the process of establishing the internships, which was orchestrated by the job consultants, was often quick and dirty, so to speak. Naturally, the job consultants used various approaches and contacts in order to find employers who would consider having an intern and consequently, the interviews would often be set up on short notice. As previously mentioned, the large number of programmes and candidates involved meant that I was unable to get a more formalized agreement and permission with each individual candidate beforehand, which would have been ethically preferable. Furthermore the job-programmes and language programmes in Denmark are characterised by a very high exchange rate of participants, who are directed to and from different authorities, programmes, social service offices and immigration units. The endeavour of sending out letters to all participants within the various programmes, which would represent the alternative to personal face-to-face permissions, was simply an insurmountable task in terms of time and financial resources.

With regards to the **issue of transcription and selection**, some of the internship interviews were transcribed from beginning to end using CA transcription criteria (see Appendix 2) including pauses and overlaps and some degree of prosodic features such as intonation, stress and soft or loud speech. After repeated listening and preliminary research, the various places within the entire corpus of data where nationality, language, and religion were topicalised or oriented to by the participants were selected and these segments were transcribed and analyzed in greater detail. Hence, the extracts used and analysed in Chapter 5 are representative, though not necessarily exhaustive, of the entire corpus as a whole. In order to characterise the internship as a specific speech situation (see section 2.2.2) I have furthermore identified and analyzed a range of extracts that show orientation towards the context of the speech situation and the various participant roles and statuses of the participants. These extracts are presented

and analyzed in Chapter 2, and as with the other extracts they are indicative and representative of various general tendencies in my data as a whole.

The process of identifying, selecting and analyzing extracts has been cyclical in the sense that I sometimes identified segments believing that they would be exemplary of a specific analytical point. However, once analyzed this would turn out not to be the case, and the analysis would reveal that something completely different was going on. More specifically, the extracts selected and examined in the analysis of membership categories related to nationality, language and religion (see Chapter 5) turned out to be useful in relation to the characterization of the speech situation. This then inspired the more general perspective of this thesis in terms of the interrelatedness of various levels of categorisation and asymmetry.

Apart from the recorded internship interviews, my initial research within and about the ‘field’ of language training and job-counselling produced a range of other data such as recordings and participant observations of language training, job-training sessions and research interviews with central figures within the field. These data are not explicitly included in the analysis, but they have, in various ways, informed and qualified my interpretations of the participants’ actions and behaviour and may be regarded as specialized membership knowledge. In order to make my analysis more accessible to the reader and not least to make my conclusions more transparent, I have chosen to present some of this specialized membership knowledge in the beginning of chapter 2. The methodological considerations and implications of this will be discussed in section 1.4 as well as in section 3.3.1.

This somewhat detached form of introduction supplies a quick overview of the chaotic and complex circumstances in which the internship interview is embedded. Nonetheless, the introduction will, hopefully, be rendered superfluous by the interactional and participant oriented analysis of the speech situation in the remainder of the chapter. Consequently, the introduction in chapter 2, and the data informing it, is secondary to the recordings and the interactional analysis of the internship interviews. The introduction is merely an offer to the reader but is not in any way central to the thesis as such.

1.3.1 Overview of Data

The table below presents an overview of the internship interviews recorded and supplies some basic information about the participants and the circumstances of each individual interview. More specifically, the table lists the *type* of interview, the *gender* and *country* of birth of the

internship candidates, the *workplaces* involved and the different *job consultants* arranging and participating in the internship interviews⁷.

All of the interviews lasted between half an hour and an hour and took place at the premises of the work-place involved. They were audio-recorded with the researcher present in all, except one, of the interviews.

Table 1: Introductory Interviews

Job-programme	Gender	Country	Workplace	Consultant
MHT-consult	F	Colombia	School	1
Kofoeds Skole	F	Bosnia	Kindergarten	2
Væksthuset	M	Somalia	Orchard	3
Væksthuset	F	Morocco	Homeless Project	3
Væksthuset	F	Iran	Residential home	4
Væksthuset	F	Afghanistan	Home Help Company	4

Table 2: Follow-up interviews

Væksthuset	F	Iraq	Kindergarten	5
UCI	F	Lebanon	Residential home	6
UCI	F	Turkey	Residential home	7
UCI	F	Bosnia	Residential home	7
UCI	F	Iran	Residential home	8
UCI	F	Turkey	Residential home	8
UCI	F	Somalia	Residential home	8
UCI	F	Somalia	Residential home	8
UCI	F	Iraq	Residential home	8
UCI	F	Bosnia	Residential home	7

⁷ The range of information presented in this overview was selected with a view to include some of the many categories and communities of meaning potentially relevant for the reader to create an impression of the corpus of data as a whole. They are not necessarily relevant to the participants, to the structure of the internship interview as presented in chapter 2, or to the analysis as presented in chapter 5.

As indicated in the table, most of the internship interviews recorded were follow-up interviews. This is related to the fact that these interviews were planned well in advance, which often made it easier to arrange the recording of the interviews.

The internship candidates were all female except for one. The distribution of gender does not represent a deliberate or intentional choice on my part; it is simply representative of the distribution in the job-counselling programmes involved. The overrepresentation of women was, in part, related to the fact that most of the recorded candidates were participating in the *UCI* programme, which focused on residential home caretakers and mainly had female participants.

The candidates were all born outside Denmark and all of them spoke Danish as a second-language. Three were from Somalia, three from Bosnia, two from Turkey, two from Iran, two from Iraq and one from Colombia, Morocco, Afghanistan, and Lebanon. Again the distribution with regards to country of origin was randomly determined by the job-counselling programmes and the practicalities of arranging the recordings. With respect to the job consultants, the majority was born in Denmark and spoke Danish as a mother tongue, but two of them were born abroad and spoke Danish as a second-language with Finnish and Persian as their respective first-languages. The employers and the employees were all, except for one, born in Denmark.

The workplaces were different in all of the internship interviews, but because of the aforementioned *UCI* programme, which focused on residential home caretaking, there was an overrepresentation of interviews at residential homes programme. Although attempts were made to establish contact with, and obtain recordings from, some of the other programmes at *UCI* that focused on different employment sectors, this was not possible.

There was great variation in the job consultants arranging and participating in the internship interviews, even between different interviews with participants from the same job-counselling programmes. The individual consultants have been assigned a number each. The total number of job consultants involved was eight, with three different job consultants from Væksthuset, and three from *UCI*, one from Kofods Skole and one from MHTConsult. Four of the job consultants only participated in one single interview, two of them participated in two interviews, one of them in three interviews and one of them participated in five interviews.

1.4 Methodological Positioning

The methodological approach of this dissertation is inspired by Discursive Psychology (DP), Conversation Analysis (CA) and Interactional Sociolinguistics (IS). This combination prompts certain questions regarding my analytical approach and my position with respect to the use of ethnographic data in particular. Overall, these questions are all related to the issue of *context* or to the general question of what is considered the relevant and interesting context of investigation. DP, CA and IS all have different positions regarding this question. This is partly due to the fact that DP and IS are both, in contrast to CA, critically driven research traditions and partly due to the fact that the methodology of CA is more restrictive than IS and some forms of DP. The combination of the three fields of research is complex but also, I would argue, very fruitful. For the sake of clarity, I have separated some of the discussions mentioned above, and in this section I focus on the discussion of ethnographic data. The discussion of DP in relation to CA involves the issue of critical versus non-critical research as well as the issue of relevance and will be presented in Chapter 3.

I will present my methodological position regarding the use of ethnographic data through a discussion of the research of interactional sociolinguist Celia Roberts and her colleagues on various forms of gatekeeping situations. This research has been a great source of inspiration because of its critical perspective on issues of immigration, institutional racism, and gatekeeping as well as its interactional means of revealing broader structures of discourse and ideology. Many other important researchers, such as sociologist Ben Rampton, Charles Goodwin, Michael Moerman and John Gumperz, might have served as equally relevant examples of the combination of interactional analysis and ethnography within the fields of sociolinguistics, anthropology and sociology. However, in this section I have chosen to focus on the work of Celia Roberts because her research has formed a central source of inspiration for some of the theoretical links made, questions asked and issues addressed in this dissertation. Yet Roberts' perspective represents a different methodological position regarding the use of ethnography than the one proposed in this dissertation. The many overlaps in theoretical and empirical orientation makes Roberts' work particularly useful in a comparative illustration of what distinguishes and characterises the methodological position and focus of my research with respect to the issue of ethnography.

Roberts and her colleagues within the field of interactional sociolinguistics in Britain use an interactional and discourse analytical framework but consider these insufficient in themselves, as this framework does not allow the investigation of the various levels of sense making, understanding and misunderstanding between participants in inter-ethnic interactions (Roberts et al. 1992; Roberts & Sarangi 1999c; Roberts & Sarangi 1999a; Roberts & Sarangi 1999b; Roberts et al. 2003; Roberts & Campbell 2006:245; Campbell & Roberts 2007). In Roberts' recent major study on job-interviews with born abroad candidates, she and Sarah Campbell include ethnographic data and a social identity perspective in order to illuminate, not only how people address and respond to each other, but how they understand and interpret one another on an interactional and a discursive level (Roberts & Campbell 2006:19). By doing this they relate the local negotiation of meaning and competences to a specific criteria of success, not only in relation to getting the job or not, but in getting a specific meaning, intention or action across from one participant to the other. Roberts and Campbell describe how the inclusion of ethnographic data, such as interviews with the participants before and after the job-interviews, makes them able to trace the process from the employers' interaction with and judgement of the candidates (Ibid.). Thus, they use interactional microanalysis as a point of departure and compare or relate this to ethnographic information in order to determine how the actions and responses of the participants corresponded with their intentions, understandings and perceptions. This form of research is typical of interactional sociolinguistic research but is also seen in for example the work of Peter Auer.

The methodological approach proposed in this dissertation does not make use of ethnographic data such as research interviews with the participants in the same way. Nor is any attempt made to check or compare the findings established through interactional analysis with the understandings and perceptions of the participants as expressed in interviews. There are two reasons for this, the first is related to the nature of my data and research question and the second is related to a diverging methodological positions. I will begin with the first reason.

More or less all of Roberts' many studies of gatekeeping interactions are focused on how the performance and behaviour of one participant is perceived, interpreted and evaluated by another participant and how in some cases, such as the job-interview, this perception and assessment is used as a basis of acceptance or rejection. This perspective was irrelevant in my study of internship interviews, because there were never more than one candidate interviewed for the same internship and all of the candidates were accepted. There were, in other words, no

way of comparing the performance of the participants in relation to the outcome, which was a central aspect of Roberts' study. I might have chosen to focus in another way on the performance of the internship candidates and the way this performance was interpreted and evaluated by the other participants in the internship interview. However, my approach to the internship interview was not guided by an interest in characterizing or evaluating the performance of the various candidates neither in relation to a specific outcome, nor in relation to other criteria of assessment. With an academic background in discursive psychology and cultural studies my interests and abilities were not related to the description and assessment of linguistic or communicative performance and ability as such, but rather with processes of meaning, categorisation and ideology. Consequently, my interest in the internship interview was to examine how the participants created meaning in relation to the internship interview as a particular speech situation, and how they constructed and established the participant roles and membership categories within this situation. This does not mean that linguistic behaviour and ability are issues that can or will be ignored within this dissertation, but they are issues that are to a larger extent considered interactional products than is the case within Roberts' work. Most of Roberts' studies seek to illuminate and change processes of discrimination through describing and altering the behaviour and understanding of both interviewers and candidates, and for this she needs the ethnographic information. This is not the case in this dissertation, as the data and the research questions are different.

The second reason for not including ethnographic interviews in my dissertation is, as previously mentioned, related to my methodological positioning, which is also reflected in my research questions. When Roberts' choice of using ethnographic interviews to inform the interactional analysis is based on the assumption that the opinions, attitudes and understandings expressed in such interviews may be viewed as reflections of an individual disposition and may be isolated from the interactional context in which they are uttered. My position on this matter is markedly different, since I, as the discursive psychologists and conversation analyst, perceive of all utterances, opinions, accounts and dispositions as interactional products within a specific context. As my analytical framework is primarily interactional, such ethnographic interviews would only constitute another realm of interactionally organized meanings and actions that would have to be analyzed in their own right. Or I would have to temporarily suspend my analytical perspective and pretend that the contributions of the participants during the ethnographic interviews could in some ways be

isolated and perceived as factual expressions of insight. Instead, I try to explain the orientations, actions and behaviour of the participants of the internship interview interactionally, remaining within the context of the speech situation.

Although the position taken in this dissertation, regarding the use of ethnographic interviews, is different from that of Roberts' and many others within the field of interactional sociolinguistics and sociolinguistics, this does not mean that I do not recognise the value and in fact the necessity of enriching and informing an interactional analysis with ethnographic information and data. The difference between the position taken in this dissertation and Roberts' position may be said to be more of a methodological than epistemological difference. This is to be understood in the sense that I apply ethnographically gathered knowledge to inform and support my analysis without operationalising an ethnographic perspective as such. One might say that I use the ethnographic information for a different purpose and furthermore grant it a different status in relation to my research questions. I acknowledge that various linguistic, cultural and social resources are used by the participants to construct the meanings and identities of here and now but, as opposed to Roberts, I only refer to and focus on such resources to the extent that they appear to be made relevant and are oriented to by the participants.

This poses certain restrictions on the analytical process. There are moments in the interaction where something seems to be going on or going wrong, which could perhaps be clarified or illuminated by replaying it to the participants and asking them. Not doing so means cutting oneself off from relating what is locally produced to a more general picture of individual dispositions, perceptions, understandings and interpretations as re-told and formulated in research interviews. In other words, when refraining from contextualizing the in situ through ethnographic data such as interviews, one prevents oneself from explaining interactional behaviour as a result of individual skills, competences, interpretations and cognitive schemata and from making generalizing observations about patterns of behaviour in relation to specific groups and communities of individuals.

There is no doubt that at times people think or feel things, which they do not express or show and vice versa. Such 'hidden' aspects of the process of meaning will not necessarily be revealed through interactional analysis only. The question is, however, whether the information about understandings, beliefs and interpretation retrospectively reconstructed or recounted by the participants is solid enough to support an analysis. The position taken within

this dissertation is that by refraining from using the participants' claims, understandings and recollections about their own behaviour and dispositions during interactions, one removes a very problematic interpretative layer from the analysis. If interviews about the participants' ideas, understandings and interpretations of what went on out of the equation is the only way of illuminating certain hidden aspects of interaction, then such aspects are, in my view, better left alone. There are advantages and disadvantages with both approaches, but the point is that Roberts' methodology allows her to ask and investigate certain questions that my methodology does not. On the other hand, my methodology leaves all conclusions open to first-hand investigation and documentation in the interactional data and in that respect it is more transparent. What you see is what you get, no more no less. This discussion is closely linked to the issue of relevance and will be explored further in Chapter 3

The way I use ethnography in my dissertation is similar to certain applied forms of conversation analysis or certain types of discursive psychology (Wetherell & Potter 1992; Day 1998; Gardner & Wagner 2004; Mondada 2004; Kjærbeck 2005; Mazeland & Berenst 2006). Here the actions and orientations of the participants are contextualised by information gathered through various forms of ethnographic methods, but the former is considered primary and prioritized in relation to the latter. While making recordings of the various internship interviews during the first year of my research, I immersed myself in the world of job-counselling of immigrants and refugees and used methods such as participant observation in various job-counselling sessions, job-training programmes, and language training programmes. Moreover, I had informal conversations with different key figures within these programmes, the students in the different language and job-programmes as well as the various participants in the different internship interviews. Furthermore, my previous employment with a consultant company working with issues related to immigration and unemployment meant that I had already gathered some information and insight regarding the legislative and organisational framework of unemployment and immigration. Over a period of about three years, I had accumulated a specialised form of membership knowledge in relation to my field of study, which in turn has informed my analysis and description of the internship interview as a communicative event. This has not, however, at any point been given priority over the orientations and actions of the participants. The specialized knowledge that I have accumulated and applied regarding the specificities of the internship interview as a speech situation is not specialised knowledge for the participants. Rather, it constitutes regular membership

knowledge that they have had gained and applied given their membership of and participation in the various contexts related to unemployment, job-counselling and language training. Hence, the ethnographic aspect of my research has consisted in a process of acquiring enough ‘membership knowledge’ to enable an understanding of the actions and orientations of the participants in the internship interview as they organize and establish the speech situation and the various roles, participant statuses and membership categories related to it.

In my analysis, I apply another level of membership knowledge that is not specifically related to the speech situation of the internship interview, but rather to the cultural embeddedness of the participants and me as members of a Danish political, social and cultural context. This membership knowledge cannot, like the aforementioned more specialised knowledge, be described as ethnographic, since it is not a result of ‘going native’ but rather ‘being native’. This membership knowledge allows access to a *common sense*, that is, a shared knowledge of structures of meaning and social organization (see section 3.1.2, 3.3.2 and 4.5.7). This enables an understanding and analysis of some of the inferences, assumptions and understandings that are expressed and established by the participants during the internship interview. This level of knowledge is the resource for describing the patterns of meaning, which constitutes the second part of my research question but, as is the case with the characterization of internship as a communicative event, this description is based primarily on the actions and orientations of the participants. By using these actions and orientations as the analytical point of departure, I seek to avoid imposed pre-established analytical categories on my data and to allow the participants to speak and act for themselves.

In Chapter 2, I present the structure and organisation of the internship interview as a communicative event. The chapter is introduced with a description of some of the ethnographically gathered membership knowledge about the context of the internship interview and the participants. This raises at least two issues that need to be addressed: First, by starting out describing the ethnographically gathered membership, there is a risk that this knowledge may seem decontextualised and abstract. Second, providing a presentation of the broader context of the internship interview before describing how the participants orient to it is somewhat at odds with my methodological position and analytical process. Leaving out the introduction would, however, pose another risk, namely that some of the complexities of the participants’ actions and orientations would be lost. By including the introduction, I hope to

provide the reader with a more qualified and informed point of entry into the actual unfolding of the internship interviews in chapter 2.

Chapter 2

The Internship Interview as a Communicative Event

The internship interview can, following Hymes and Gumperz (Gumperz & Hymes 1972:Chapter 4, §23; Hymes 1972) be characterised as a communicative event. This is a way of situating a specific speech situation in a broader linguistic, social and cultural context, while simultaneously outlining some of the features of the particular speech situation that influences, and is influenced by, the actions, orientations and social organisation of its participants. As Hymes states:

As to basis: one cannot take linguistic form, a given code, or even speech itself, as a limiting frame of reference. One must take as context a community, or network of persons, investigating its communicative activities as a whole, so that any use of channel and code takes its place as part of the resources upon which the members draw. (Hymes 1974:4)

Hymes characterises the communicative event by eight different variables and uses these as the basis for a cross-cultural comparison. As my aim, unlike Hymes', is not to do ethnography of speaking, I will not go systematically through the various components that Hymes lists as constituents of the communicative event (Hymes 1974:10). Instead, my overall goal is to embed a conversation analytical approach in a broader contextual perspective. As Levinson (Levinson 1992:70) points out, not all of the variables that Hymes chooses to focus on are equally important. Following Levinson, I will focus on the structure of the communicative event, and the way this structure is related to and shaped by the specific activity, the different episodes that constitute this activity and the specific goals and strategies of the participants in relation to this activity (Ibid.:70-71). The characterization of the internship interview as a communicative event in this section is, although inspired by Hymes conceptualization of communicative event, speech situation and speech event, closer in purpose and aim to the characterization of activity type by Levinson. The following definition by Levinson shows that his conceptualization of activity types is less rigid and to a greater extent defined by the activities, actions and strategies of the participants than Hymes' notion of communicative event.

I take the notion of an activity type to refer to a fuzzy category whose focal members are goal-defined, socially constituted, bounded, events with *constraints* on participants, setting, and so on, but above all on the kinds of allowable

contributions. Paradigm examples would be teaching, a job interview, a jural interrogation, a football game, a task in a workshop, a dinner party, and so on...It appeals to the intuition that social events come along a gradient formed by two polar types, the totally prepackaged activity, on the one hand (e.g. Roman Mass) and the largely unscripted event on the other (e.g. a chance meeting on the street) (Levinson 1992:69).

Levinson's approach to the characterization of interactions as activity types is useful, because he makes the specific speech acts and activities of the participants the point of departure and draws conclusions about the activity type as a whole from their observable illocutionary force and inferential outcome. In other words, he establishes the structure of the activity type from within and uses the contextual knowledge, which feeds and supports this structure as a background for understanding specific utterances, inferences and activities within the interaction. The characterization of an activity type is in this respect not an end-goal in itself, but rather a means to a better understanding of the dispositions and orientations of participants in interaction.

The aim of outlining the internship interview as a communicative event is motivated by the acknowledgement that the actions and inferences of the participants in it are influenced by the participants' goals and strategies regarding the internship and the internship interview. These goals and strategies are shaped by the participants' knowledge of and expectations to the internship, and the internship interview as a specific activity type or communicative event as well as experience with other similar practices. The internship interview as well as the participants' knowledge and past experiences are fundamentally shaped by, and embedded in, a social, cultural and institutional context that must be considered, if one is to understand what is locally achieved and negotiated. Roberts and Sarangi describe this need to contextualise the local in a broader context in relation to their study of oral assessment of General Practitioners:

...we needed to approach the topic of oral assessment from a broader perspective since the oral examinations were embedded in wider institutional processes related to the setting up and staffing of the exams (Roberts & Sarangi 1999c:478).

The purpose of such contextualisation is not to suggest that the organisation and structure of the internship interview or the actions of the participants are pre-determined by linguistic, cultural and social norms and conventions distilled in a specific genre. Rather the ambition is to outline the internship interview as an event which is constituted in the meeting of locally established meanings and actions and a broader spectrum of linguistic, social and cultural

resources and practices. This dialectic approach to speech situations as both ritualized and locally produced is clearly formulated in the work of Erickson & Schultz:

We have said that the social organization and the cultural organization of communication are jointly involved in the conduct of face-to-face interaction. This interaction can be said to be locally produced in the taking of practical action of the moment by the particular people who encounter each other in an immediately local face-to-face situation. It is through the local production that distinctive local nuances of meaning and impression arise. The production is orderly and institutionalized, yet also creative and spontaneous. We assume here that people apply cultural principles in their social operating face-to-face, but that the practical application of these normative standards is not done by people in mechanical ways (Erickson & Schultz 1982:8).

What Erickson and Schultz emphasise here is how people are neither free-floating agents that continually recreate and establish the world around them, nor automatised puppets in a web of norms, conventions and ritualized practices. Instead, people are conceived of as active users of available and established meanings and practices, which they contribute to shaping and creating. From this perspective the internship interview is an interactional event, which is constituted by the reproduction of other meanings and practices as well and the construction of new meanings and actions generated from the specific speech situation and the specific participation framework of each interaction. The cultural and social organisation in which the internship interview is embedded must, in other words, be established by looking at practices and meanings within the internship interview and mirroring these with the meanings and practices of other similar or related interactions.

In this chapter, I will look at these various aspects of the internship interview as a communicative event beginning with **1)** how it is established and arranged as part of a broader social context and structure. This will involve describing the legislative framework on unemployment of immigrants and refugees, which dictates a certain range of options and obligations for the candidate and the internship, and the job-counselling system of which the internship is a part. This has consequences for the arrangement and structure of the internship and the internship interview as such. Moving from the broader structures in which the internship interview is embedded, I will look at **2)** the structuring of the actual internship interview. This involves describing the participation framework, characterizing the institutionality of the interaction and describing the various speech events that can be said to be involved in the speech situation. All of these descriptions will be made from the perspective of

the participants and will be based on observations of how the participants orient to, organize and structure the event and the context of the event. What is being outlined here is, in other words, an emic (Pike 1967; Hymes 1974:11) perspective on the structuring of the internship interview. The structure of the internship interview will be made clearer by relating the various speech events that the internship interview comprises with other institutional interactions such as the job-interview, which contrary to the internship interview has been elaborately described and analyzed from an ethnomethodological and interactional perspective. The similarities and differences between the internship interview and these other interactions will make the hybrid nature of the internship interview as an event more clear, in that it is at once formal and informal, evaluative and yet merely social, structured and yet highly unstructured. This will lead to 3) a discussion of the internship interview as a gate-keeping encounter, which will be based on other studies of different forms of gate-keeping encounters, one of which is exactly the job-interview. I will argue that although the stakes and risks of the internship interview are different from those of for example the job-interview or the medical consultation, it is nevertheless a site of cultural, linguistic and professional gate-keeping, which is manifested in the sequential structure of the interaction and the participants' behaviour.

When describing the internship interview as a communicative event and its embedding in a broader social and cultural context, the question of how or whether to distinguish between the two presents itself. When looking at the internship interview as constituted by a range of practices and orientations by its participants, the clear distinction between a cultural and a social realm, as it is formulated in the previous quote by Erickson and Schultz, seem untenable. As will be described in Chapter 4, culture is defined in this thesis as flexible communities of meaning that are constituted by and constitutive of processes of meaning and social organisation, and as such the social and cultural realm are considered different yet intertwined dimensions of action and meaning. However, when trying to describe some of these meanings and practices as reproductions or reformulations of an organisation of meaning and practice found in other contexts, it becomes necessary to describe and refer to aspects of culture that are institutionally and socially sedimented and solidified.

In the following description of the broader context of the internship interview, I will describe the manifestation of the legislative, administrative and institutional contexts in which it is embedded, and which can be seen to permeate and situate the internship interview as a communicative event. Some aspects of these contexts, such as the legislative system, actively

define and are defined by the national borders of the community Denmark. Other aspects, such as the administrative and bureaucratic system related to unemployment and social service, the institutional framework related to language teaching, and the institutional context of the interview are not exclusively found in and defined by a Danish context. But these social contexts are simultaneously part of and influenced by a broader cultural context, which contributes to shaping their specific realization. Job interviews in the UK and Denmark are not necessarily similar in the same way that the distribution of roles and activities between employees and employers at a school are not necessarily similar in Denmark or Pakistan, or in one Danish school and another. In the following description of the context(s) that the internship interview may be said to be embedded in and influenced by, I will therefore make a point of not distinguishing between a cultural and a social realm. Instead, I will simply identify different contexts of practice that are socially constituted and recognizable to an extent that allows them to be held up as mirrors of the practices and meanings within the internship interview. A further elaboration of the notion of culture in chapter 4 will illuminate how such contexts are understood as elements of the individual history of participation in various communities of meaning and practice.

2.1 The Broader Context of the Internship and the Internship Interview

The internship interview is in many respects a communicative event that is interwoven with, and a result of, various legislative, structural and administrative matters related to immigration, the labour-market, social policies and the political situation in Denmark. Sarangi and Roberts, inspired by Berger and Luckman, use the term institutional order to describe this embedding in the following way:

Broadly speaking, all institutions are made up of shared habitual practices, which can be understood with reference their own history and tradition (Sarangi & Roberts 1999:3)

This web of relations constituting the institutional order may be said to constitute one aspect of the broader context of the internship interview which potentially informs the knowledge and practices of the members of the interaction and hereby potentially influences the processes of meaning and social organisation within it. Duranti and Goodwin (Goodwin & Duranti 1994:8; Sarangi & Roberts 1999:25) use the notion of *extrasituational context* to refer to the level of context that involves wider social, political and cultural institutions and discourses, which is the level of context described here. Following the methodological position of

ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis, the influence of the extra-situational level of context should be described from a participant perspective that is as the participants explicitly or implicitly make such aspects relevant. Hence, the following description of aspects of the extrasituational context is, as described in section 1.4, a description of those contextual aspects which inform the participants' membership knowledge as manifested and invested in their actions and utterances within the internship interviews. The following analysis of the structure of the internship interview in section 2.2 will show that the various aspects of the extra-situational context described in this section enable the actual occurrence of the internship interview. Moreover, they inform the structure, organisation and content of the internship interview as well as the distribution of roles and rights between the participants and hereby the development and the outcome of the event. While this influence can be observed and described through interactional micro-analysis, it can only be properly understood if this micro-analysis is supplemented with some of the specialized background knowledge that that participants are in possession of. Sarangi and Roberts (Sarangi & Roberts 1999:21-23) describe the difference between these two types of research as front stage and backstage respectively and argue the need for both. Front stage research is the type of research that deals with a given institutional encounters in its own right and describes the actions and behaviours of the participants based on interactional analysis. Backstage research, on the other hand, is the type of research that deals with all the actions and meanings 'behind the scenes' before and after the institutional encounter studied. These actions and meanings can only be accessed by other methodological means such as ethnography. The methodological position of this thesis, as described in chapter 1 section, implies an emphasis on front stage research. Consequently, the following presentation of broader contextual aspects of the internship interview is meant to provide just enough of a glance 'behind the scenes' to enable an understanding of the dramas that unfold in the various internship interviews.

I will begin by describing the legislative framework of the internship and the function and position of the job consultant in relation to the government, the employer and the candidate. I will then move on to focus on the situation of the employer with respect to their ambiguous role in the internship and the internship interview and finally describe the situation of the candidate with respect to immigration status, Danish language skills and history of employment. The following sections will, in other words, provide some of the contextual knowledge that explains and introduces the internship interview as a specific communicative

event. Furthermore, this knowledge may also be said to influence the actions, goals and strategies of the participants.

While the knowledge and background provided extend beyond that which is talked about and constructed within the various internship interviews, it is selected on the basis of some of the roles, positions, categories and motivations that are made relevant by the participants throughout the entire corpus. Presenting the contextual knowledge before illustrating how this contextual knowledge is used and made relevant by the participants reflects a pedagogically motivated choice, rather than the actual analytical process, which has in fact been the reverse. By supplying the contextual background for the internship interview I hope to pre-empt some of the questions that may arise in relation to the actual analysis of the actions and orientations of the participants. In other words, the aim is to provide the reader with an idea of the language game and the goals of the players (Levinson 1992) before showing sequences from the actual matches. The knowledge and understanding informing this representation is, however, derived through many hours of less informed and guided viewing, listening and micro-analysis. I employ etic (Pike 1967; Hymes 1974:11) categories such as interviewer, job consultants, employers in this initial characterization of the internship interview as a communicative event and the situations, functions, and goals of the participants. These categories are derived from microanalysis and will be further investigated, challenged, undermined and illustrated in 2.2, in which a move is made from a broader contextual to a more local and emic perspective on the orientations and constructions of the participants.

2.1.1 Internships as an Employment Strategy and a Government Initiative

The term and phenomenon ‘virksomhedspraktik’, which means *internship* or work-placement, has been used in Denmark for many years as an integrated element of various educational programmes that require some form of practical training and experience such as nursing, pedagogy or professions such as chefs, electricians or bakers. However, with the *Integration Act* (‘Integrationsloven’) in 1998, ‘virksomhedspraktik’ was introduced as an obligatory work-placement for newly arrived immigrants and refugees as part of an introductory programme called *The Introduction Programme* (Introduktionsforløbet). The Introduction Programme is a three year integration programme, consisting of various forms of *activation* (aktivering) of the immigrants or refugees such as courses in Danish language and culture, specific educational programmes and *internships*. The legislative formulation surrounding the different forms of

activation in the Introduction Programme, including the internship, was at that time as follows⁸:

Legal extract 1: The Integration Act

<p style="text-align: center;">Chapter 4</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The Introduction Programme</i></p> <p>§ 23. The local council may offer activation to aliens who qualify for the introduction allowance pursuant to chapter 5. The activation period is planned in accordance with the alien's individual activity plan, cf. § 19.</p> <p><i>Stk.2.</i> The activation period may include one or more of the following types of activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1) Short guidance and clarification programmes on work- and education options and with access to try occupational interests• 2) Internship, including individual job-training with private and public employers pursuant to §§ 22 and 24 in the Act on Active Employment Measures.• 3) Specifically adapted educational activities• 4) Specifically adapted guidance and internship programmes, upgrading courses or other similar programmes combining work and education.• 5) Voluntary and unpaid activities based on the alien's own wishes; the local council shall assess the activities in terms of their societal relevance, or educational and workrelated relevance for the individual.• 6) Adult or supplementary education in accordance with the alien's own wishes, included in the regulations on educational programmes to which educational support and educational leave can be granted, determined by the Minister for Employment pursuant to § 27, stk. 1, in the Act on Active• Labour Market Policy and § 3, stk. 2, in the Act on Leave.
--

(1998:Chapter 4, § 23)

The introduction programme is part of *The Integration Act* whose declared purpose is

...ensure that newly arrived immigrants are granted the possibility to use their abilities and resources in the prospect of becoming participating and contributing citizens on equal terms with society's other citizens (2006aChapter 1, § 1; my translation).

The introduction programme, including the internship, is thus intended to assist the social, economic and cultural integration of immigrants and refugees in Denmark. As described by Rezaei (Rezaei 2005) the Danish labour market is becoming increasingly divided into a

⁸ The translations of the following extracts from Danish legislative documents are my own. The original Danish versions are found in Appendix 1.

primary labour market with the well-paid, professional jobs being carried out by Danish citizens of Danish descent and a secondary labour market with the poorly paid jobs that require no formal education being carried out by immigrants or refugees irrespective of their level of formal education. This secondary labour market also contains the self-employed business-owners working in retail or the food-industry. Rezaei describes this as *the dual labour market*.

The situation with the labour-market and the consequences that this entails for the welfare state may be part of the incentive of the government to set up these job training programmes. The job training programmes often substitute additional language training, as a way of getting immigrants and refugees integrated into the secondary as well as the primary labour market. The rationale is that many immigrants and refugees have professional education and experience, which is wasted on low-income, non-professional jobs, while there are many high-income, professional positions with a shortage of applicants. Since the passing of the Integration Act, the internship has become an increasingly common employment strategy for not only immigrants, but for the unemployed in general. The legislative framework around the internship has since 1998 been developed and specified in the 2003 *Act on Active Employment Measures* (*Lov om en aktiv beskæftigelsesindsats*), where the responsibility of the municipality and the job centres is also distributed and formulated (2003b). This distribution of responsibility changed in 2007 so that everyone who becomes unemployed has to register with a municipal jobcentre regardless of whether they are applying for financial support from a union or from the government (2007a).

One of the things specified in the *Act on Active Employment Measures* from 2003 was that a *contact programme* ('kontaktforløb') should be established between the social worker/job-counsellor and the citizen. The programme would involve individual meetings between the citizen and the social worker or job-counsellor at regular intervals, with a maximum interval of three months (2003bSection III, Chapter 7). The contact programme also involved deciding on a range of activities and goals for the citizen to undertake, and the meetings were to ensure that these activities and goals were met. The contact programme was closely related to another element in the *Act on Active Employment Measures*, namely that an individual job plan would be developed for each unemployed citizen. This job plan should inform the job seeking person of how the chances for ordinary employment within the current labour market could be improved, based on the individual person's skills, background and interest (2003bSection III, Chapter 9).

Another important clarification in the *Act on Active Employment Measures* was the legislative framework for the internship, which had only been mentioned in the law on integration. This framework was formulated as follows:

Legal extract 2: Act on Active Employment Measures

Chapter 11
Internship
<p>§ 42 The local council may offer an internship with a public or private enterprise to aliens who need clarification of their occupational goals, or who faces difficulties in finding employment on ordinary pay and working conditions, or employment with a wage supplement, owing to lack of professional, linguistic or social competencies.</p> <p>Stk. 2. Persons, included by § 2, nr. 7 who receive unemployment support or special allowances pursuant to §§ 74 and 74 in the the Active Social Policy Act, can be offered an internship with the intention of testing the person's availability for work pursuant to the Active Social Policy Act §§ 74 b, 74 c, 74 g and 74 i.</p> <p>Stk. 3. The offer is given with the intention of determining or upgrading the person's professional, social or linguistic competences as well as clarifying the employment goals.</p>

(2003bChapter 11, § 42)

In *The Integration Act* from 1998 the internship was formulated as part of the specific duties of foreigners in relation to the *activation* element of the *Introduction Programme*. In the *Act on Active Employment Measures* from 2003, the internship was now presented as an offer to all persons who either needed to clarify their occupational goals in general or who lacked professional, linguistic or social competences.

One might say that as the internship is made into a general offer to a broader range of unemployed citizens, the specifications of the offer, or the group of people who can make use of the offer, are elaborated. While the group of persons being offered the internship has hereby changed, the internship remains a strategy for integrating people, who are for some reason or other 'stuck' in unemployment, into the labour market. What is important to emphasise in this context is that these internships and the internship interviews are not voluntary in the same way as other internships that are part of a career plan or an educational programme chosen by an individual. This is by no means to say that the candidates have not been included and consulted in the planning and decision-making process around the internship interview. Part of the job counselling programmes consists of personal meetings between the job consultant and the participants in the programme, where the interests, competences and situation of the

participants are discussed. For many, if not all, of the candidates the internship is an appreciated possibility for moving closer to ordinary employment. Nonetheless, the internship and the process of establishing the internship is embedded in an institutional, legislative and administrative context which creates a framework for the internship with regards to for example its content, time-frame and purpose and sets up a set of potential relations and roles of the parties involved in the internship and the internship interview. The following three sections will illuminate this by describing the situation and position of the job consultants, the employers and the internship candidates respectively.

2.1.2 The Situation and Position of the Job Consultant

In order to describe the function and position of the job consultant, it is necessary to also describe the various different organisations and centres undertaking the job service in the municipality of Copenhagen, which is the focus of this study.

As previously mentioned, the job service for unemployed citizens in Denmark has previously been divided between the municipal job-centres, which belong to *The Employment and Integration Committee (Beskæftigelses- og integrationsforvaltningen)*, and the job centres under *The Employment Service (Arbejdsformidlingen)*, which is a sub-division under *The Ministry of Employment (Beskæftigelsesministeriet)* (2003bSection II, Chapter 2 and 3). The municipal job centres have previously been in charge of helping people who are not part of a union and therefore receive public welfare. AF, on the other hand, is an institution that deals only with unemployment and does not provide any financial aid or other social services. Consequently, they have previously dealt only with people who are part of a union, and receive their financial support from there, and with people who are not part of a union but have been evaluated by the municipal job-counsellors as not having any other problems besides unemployment (2003bSection II, Chapter 4 and 5).

In 2005, the Danish government passed a law (2005b) in relation to a large municipal reform⁹ in 2004. The legislation united the services of AF and the municipality under *The Ministry of Occupation* by establishing four different employment regions that together cover all of Denmark and are individually responsible for the employment services within the different regions. This change in the responsibility and services of the previous jobcentres

⁹ (<http://www.uvm.dk/nyheder/kommunalreform.htm?menuid=6410>)

under AF and the municipality respectively was, however, only beginning to be implemented during the time of my recordings.

The Job Consultants at the Employment Centres

Besides *AF* and the municipal job centres there are also a variety of specialized *employment centres* (*beskæftigelsescentre*) that each focus on and cover different groups of unemployed citizens. One of these employment centres, *UCI*, which is an abbreviation for *Undervisnings Center for Indvandrere* and translates into *Employment Center for Immigrants*, undertakes and specializes in job services for immigrants. This employment centre represents 8 of the 16 job-candidates in my corpus. The role and obligation of all the employment centres, besides from providing job counselling, is to undertake the qualification and adaptation of job-seekers' competences within areas and professions, where there is a shortage of labour and therefore a realistic possibility of achieving employment. At *UCI* this task has been carried out by placing the job-seekers in different training and job counselling programmes focusing on specific professional fields such as day care, health care, truck driving and so on. These different programmes are all represented by job consultants, who are responsible for teaching the professionally specific Danish skills, giving information about the job and the skills required, providing counselling in application procedures and any additional educational needs required, and finally establishing and overseeing the internship.

The candidates from *UCI* in my corpus are all from the programme for health care workers, except one who is from the programme for day-care. The idea behind the programmes at *UCI* is that language teaching should be as closely related to specific professional training and to a specific work-context, which is an idea that is similar to the one behind the Industrial Language Training programme developed nationally in Britain from the mid 70'ies to the end of the 80'ies by Roberts et al. (Jupp et al. 1982).

The External Job Consultants

The employment centres are, however, only one of the places that the municipality and *AF* refer job-seekers to. There are also a range of external consultants and job service providers that are paid by the municipality or *AF* to provide a specific job service related to a specific need, interest or situation of the job-seeker. These external consultants market themselves on the efficiency and innovativeness of their job-application programmes, which often extend beyond the counselling of *AF* and the municipal job centres. Furthermore, they often specialize

in certain groups of job-seekers such as academics, long-term unemployed, people with social problems, physical problems, immigrants etc.

One of the external partners used by AF and the municipality is *Væksthuset* (*The Greenhouse*), which is a corporate foundation established in 1992. *Væksthuset* specializes in job-counselling and job-programmes for people that have particular difficulties with getting and keeping a job because of various problems such as alcoholism, drug-abuse, mental illness and psycho-social issues and language difficulties. One of the responsibilities of *Væksthuset* is to introduce refugees and immigrants to the Danish labour market and the job-application process and they represent five of the candidates in my corpus¹⁰. The counselling consists in mapping out the interests and competences of the candidates and arranging an internship in order to create professional networks, give the candidate insight and experience with the possibilities and challenges of the labour market, and finally to give the candidate an opportunity to improve their Danish language skills.

The function of the job consultants at *Væksthuset* is very similar to that of the job consultant from *UCI*, except that the teaching of the candidates is not oriented towards a specific professional field or area, since *Væksthuset* is not, as *UCI* is, divided into professional sub-departments and is not a municipal *Employment Centre*. The teaching at *Væksthuset* is therefore more focused on general themes related to job-application procedures such as how to write an application, how to interpret job-advertisements and themes related to the labour-market in general.

Another of the external job consultant partners representing one of the candidates in my corpus is *Kofoeds Skole* (*Kofoed's School*), which is a self-governing institution that was founded in 1928 to provide counselling, work, teaching, practical help, and even shelter for people who are unemployed and/or have social, physical or mental problems of various kinds. As opposed to most of the other external partners that are placed under the *Ministry of Employment*, *Kofoeds Skole* is placed under the *Ministry of Social Affairs*. *Kofoeds Skole* is furthermore different from *Væksthuset* and *UCI* because besides from offering counselling and various courses, it has a range of different work-places on the premises such as a printing facility, a tool-shop, a cleaning service, a drycleaners, and a recycling station. Here, people can

¹⁰ It should be noted that the organisation of *Væksthuset* as described here is different from the time of my recording, where the particular problems related to employment were specially targeted in sub-departments or programmes. Back then there was a specific programme called *Jobvækst* that dealt with 'people with another ethnic background than Danish', which the candidates in my corpus were part of.

get training and experience as part of their job-plan and educational programme. The people that are referred to *Kofoeds Skole* by the municipality or *AF* are usually people with a long history of unemployment with a minimum of one year, and a lot of them have other problems besides unemployment. Like *UCI*, *Kofoeds Skole* offers a range of different courses, some of which are aimed at specific professions, but others being specific language courses or courses that are not specifically work-related such as drama and music, food and exercise.

Kofoeds Skole has divided its job-counselling into different projects, some of which are more generally aimed at people who have been out of the labour market and the educational system for a longer period of time. Other projects address specific groups such as people with alcohol or other addiction problems, immigrants and refugees, or even more specifically immigrant women who receive no financial support from the government. All of the projects involved counselling, teaching of various kinds and internships.

The candidate in my data corpus, who was represented by *Kofoeds Skole*, was part of a project called *UNO*, which was one of the more general courses, where few of the participants were immigrants and refugees. This gave a quite different dynamic in the teaching sessions, as the course was not specifically designed for immigrants and refugees. The job consultant therefore constantly had to strike a balance between making the course generally applicable and yet addressing the language problems that occurred from time to time. Project *UNO* is different from some of the other projects at *Kofoeds Skole*, and from *Væksthuset* and *UCI*, since it was individually funded by *The Ministry of Employment*, although established and carried out at *Kofoeds Skole* by job consultants employed at the premises. The participants at *UNO* had all been unemployed for a longer period and fell under the *Act of Active Social Politics* (*Lov om aktiv Socialpolitik*) and the *Active employment initiative Act* (*Lov om en aktiv beskæftigelsesindsats*), and in that respect the functions and goals of the job consultant were similar to the other job-counselling projects mentioned.

The final form of job-counselling project that I will describe is even more individual and detached from the employment counselling apparatus described thus far, in that it was administered and carried out by **MHTConsult**, a private consultant company, in cooperation with a special integration unit called *Modtageenheden* (*The Reception Unit*) under the municipality of Copenhagen. *Modtageenheden* is in charge of receiving and counselling newly arrived immigrants and refugees in Copenhagen. The newly arrived refugees and immigrants in Denmark are all included under the *Integration Act* (*Integrationsloven*), which means that

they have to participate in the former mentioned 3-year *Introduction Programme*, and *Modtageenheden* is responsible for administering this commitment and referring them to various activities and courses.

In contrast to *Væksthuset* and *UCI*, *MHTConsult* has not specialized in job-counselling projects of the sort previously described, but carries out a variety of development projects and analytical projects related to employment and integration. However, one of their projects, *Fra Chauffør til AC'er* (*From chauffeur to Academic*) which one of my candidates took part in, was a job-counselling project for unemployed immigrants who received no financial support from the government and had a higher education. The purpose of the project was to develop methods for an efficient clarification of the interests and competences of unemployed people with higher education (Integrationsenhed & MHTConsult 2005). In this respect it was more of a development project than project *UNO* or *Jobvækst*.

However, the project was in many ways similar to these projects since it also consisted of individual counselling, some degree of teaching and not least the establishment of internships for the participants with the aim of a future ordinary employment at the work-place.

The structure and the arrangement of the internship was, however, different from all the other projects previously mentioned, as the participants did not receive any financial support from the government and were therefore not influenced by the *Active employment initiative Act* (*Lov om en aktiv beskæftigelsesindsats*) and *Act of active social Politics* (*Lov om aktiv socialpolitik*). This meant that the internship was funded by the interns themselves and that the time period might be longer and be extended or terminated more freely. Furthermore, it meant that the job consultant only had obligations related to the stated goals and criterions of the project outline and to the regulations and rules of the Introduction Programme. They were not obligated by the requirements, rules and regulations of the municipal job service or the social service system.

To summarize, the functions of the job consultants involved in the projects at *UCI*, *Væksthuset*, *Kofoeds Skole* and *MHTConsult* to varying degrees involve: 1) having individual counselling sessions with the candidates, 2) teaching classes on various themes related to job-application procedures, the labour market and work-place culture, and 3) helping establish an internship for the candidate by contacting different employers, setting up an internship interview, taking part in the interview, writing up an internship contract and having a follow-up interview with

the candidate and the employer, where the internship is evaluated and any possibilities for future employment are discussed.

The internship candidates in my data are spread across different job-counselling projects that represent a broad variety of the different forms and contexts of job-counselling taking place within the municipality of Copenhagen. These different forms and contexts, and their different relations to a structural, administrative and legislative context, all influence the structure, administration and terms of the internships and the internship interview as such. The diagram below represents the various job-counselling actors in play and the specific employment centres, individual projects and external consultants representing the job-seeking candidates in my data:




Figure 1: Various actors undertaking job-counselling

Thus, this job-counselling arena is rather complex, and the participants are not likely to have any knowledge of, or interest in, the various institutions and departments that it involves. Nonetheless, the overview in its entirety gives some idea of the institutional embeddedness of the job-counselling offered and the internship interviews as one aspect of this. The different

placements of the various job consultants meant that different procedures were being followed and different methods were being used in the job-counselling. This was also reflected in the practices related to the arrangement and realization of the internship interview. Various difference in the job counselling programmes in this way revealed themselves that were related to their individual status, placement, role and 'trademark' within the job service arena as a whole. A comparative analysis of the different job counselling programmes and the way they relate to differences in the internship interviews will however not be pursued further in this thesis.

2.1.3 The Situation and Position of the Employers

Thus far I have outlined the situation and position of the job consultants in relation to the broader contextual framework and the specific job-counselling programmes that are represented in my data. Another central actor in the establishment and structuring of the internship and the internship interview as a specific form of communicative event is the employer. On the one hand, the employer is embedded in the explicit and implicit laws and rules of the labour-market and the specific work-place, and on the other, s/he has to comply with the legislative, administrative and structural requirements of the internship. The employers in my study represent very different types of companies, namely schools, kindergartens, cleaning companies, residential homes, an orchard and an organisation for homeless people; some of these were public, while others were privately owned. The majority of the work-places represented were, however, residential homes and kindergartens, since these areas suffer a shortage of labour and require a relatively low level of professional training and experience.

The employer is placed in an ambiguous position with regards to the internship, the communicative event of the internship interview and the other participants. On the one hand, s/he is the person accepting to take the intern on, but on the other, s/he has none of the usual responsibilities and obligations that go with being an employer, because the intern is only there on a temporary and voluntary basis. This means that the employer is not an employer in the traditional sense, but rather, or perhaps equally so, a benefactor who has agreed to do the intern and the job consultant a favour by agreeing on the internship. At the same time, however, the employer is very much taking on the role of the employer during the internship interview, since s/he ultimately has to accept taking the candidate and is to a great extent the one orchestrating the communicative event. In section 2.2 the concrete manifestation of this

orchestration will be elaborated. The purpose here is merely to outline the role and situation of the employer as it is defined by legislative and bureaucratic frameworks and demands.

One of the factors influencing the role and situation of the employer are the legislative guidelines for the duration of an internship, which are outlined in *Bekendtgørelse af lov om en aktiv beskæftigelsesindsats* (*Declaration of the Act on Active Employment Measures*) (2008aChapter 11). For those interns who are union members and receive financial support from their union during the internship, the maximum duration of the internship is 4 weeks. For interns who are not members of a union and receive financial support from the government the maximum duration is 13 weeks, if the person has no work-experience, has been unemployed for a longer period or is considered to have difficulty getting a job with a subsidised salary (*ansættelse med løntilskud*¹¹). For people covered under §2 sections 3 and 4, that is to say people who receive financial support from the government for reasons besides unemployment and people who are limited in their ability to work, the period of the internship can be further extended to 26 weeks or even longer (2007aChapter 11). This means that the employer can expect to have the intern working for him or her without any financial cost for at least 4 weeks, and perhaps even longer than 26 weeks. However, since the employer is often not aware of the specific rules in this area, this is often something which is discussed during the internship interview. Part of the employer's role in the internship interview is, in other words, to establish the duration of the internship and to plan accordingly.

Another thing that has to be established during the internship interview is the obligations of the employer and the work-place that having the intern will entail. According to the *Declaration of Active Employment Measures* (2008a), the interns are covered by the legislation regarding work environment and the law against differential treatment on the labour market. This basically means that if the employers agree to give the candidate an internship, they are responsible for his or her well-being at the work-place with regards to general health and equal treatment. In many of the interviews the employer shows orientation towards this role and responsibility, sometimes after encouragement or reminders from the job consultant.

¹¹ *Ansættelse med løntilskud* (Employment with subsidised salary) is another legislative measure conducive to employment. This measure was introduced in 1990 under the *Municipal Act on Employment Measures* (*Lov om kommunal beskæftigelsesindsats*) (Hjarnø 1990) as an offer to those unemployed due to specific circumstances. It was later made into a more general and integrated part of the employment policy with the *Act on Active Employment Policy* (*Lov om en aktiv arbejdsmarkedspolitik*) (1993). It currently forms a central element of the employment initiatives described under the *Act on Active Employment Measures* (2008aChapter 12).

2.1.4 The Situation and Position of the Internship Candidates

As described previously, the candidates in my data are participating in different job-counselling programmes depending on their individual situation in relation to their immigrant status, financial support situation, the length of their period of unemployment, their physical and mental health, language skills etc. In this section, I will elaborate on this from the perspective of the candidates, which will give an understanding of the status and importance of the internship and the internship interview. The parameters that are highlighted as influential to the situation of the internship interview have been selected according to what is emphasised in the legislative and bureaucratic framework and are furthermore made relevant by the participants themselves during the internship interviews.

Immigration status

The kind of internships described in this dissertation were, as previously mentioned, introduced as an ‘activation’ strategy for immigrants and refugees in the *Integration Act* in 1998 (1998). Later on it was included in the *Act on Active Employment Measures* (2003b) and is now one of the three different employment measures. The unemployed must accept, participate in and complete one of the three offers in order to receive financial support from either the union or the government (2008aChapter 8)¹². It follows that the arrangement of the internship is not necessarily related to the candidate’s immigrant status, and many unemployed people with a Danish background are also offered internships as part of their activation strategy. However, when looking at the various job-counselling programmes that the candidates in this study participate in, it is clear that being an immigrant is very much part of the context of their internships and consequently also of the internship interviews. This is due to the fact that the job counselling programmes are all, except one (Project UNO), specifically aimed at immigrants and refugees. Thus, the candidates in this study are obviously offered an internship because they are unemployed, but they have been referred to specific job-counselling programmes that specifically address the immigration status of the participants.

The immigration status of the participants is, however, not the same for all the participants and the reasons for their referral to the various specific job-counselling projects also vary. Some have been granted asylum and have the status of refugees, while others have been granted a temporary or permanent residence permit because they are married or related to

¹² The other two offers are: 1.Guidance and qualification, and 2. Job with salary supplement

someone who is either a Danish citizen or has been granted permission to stay (2007bChapter 1, § 9). According to the *Declaration of the Act of Integration of aliens in Denmark* (*Bekendtgørelse af lov om integration af udlændinge i Danmark*) (2007bChapter 2, §4 and Chapter 4, § 19) immigrants and refugees are immediately turned over to the responsibility of the municipality. Within a month the municipality must offer an integration program called *The Introduction Programme*. Ten of the participants have been in Denmark for more than four years and have finished *The Introduction Programme*, which means that they have not been referred from *Modtageenheden* but from either *AF* or one of the regular municipal job centres in Copenhagen. Six of the participants have been in Denmark from one to four years at the time of the recording and have not yet finished the three-year *Introduction Programme*. Consequently, they have been referred to the job-counselling programme and the internship as an integrated part of the *Introduction Programme* (2008bChapter 1, § 11).

The immigration status of the participants is central to their placement in specific programmes, but it also contributes, in various ways, to raising the stakes of the internship and the internship interview. In order to elaborate on this, there is a need for some more legislative background information. Irrespective of whether one arrives in Denmark as a refugee or an immigrant, it is possible to obtain either a permanent or a temporary residence permit. If you hold a temporary resident permit, you may apply for permanent residency provided that you fulfil a number of conditions. This is where the internship and the job-counselling become relevant. Normally you can only obtain a permanent residence permit after seven years (2008bChapter 1, § 11, Stk. 3). However, you may obtain a permanent residence permit after only 5 or even 3 years provided that you:

Legal extract 3: Declaration of the Aliens Act

- 2) have held permanent employment or been self-employed here in this country during the last 3 years prior to the announcement of permanent residency,
- 3) have not received any other financial assistance under the terms of the Active Social Policy Act or the Integration Act than negligible single-payment grants that are not directly related to subsistence or payments that replace or are comparable to salary or pension, and welfare
- 4) have achieved a significant connection and relation to Danish society.

(2008bChapter 1, § 11, Stk. 4)

This means that the participants who have been in the country for more than three years, but who have not yet obtained a permanent residence permit, getting a permanent job and getting off financial support from the government is potentially a way of earning the right to possibly obtain permanent residence before the otherwise fixed period of seven years. In any case, for all the participants the permanent residence permit is conditioned by undertaking the obligations of the *Introduction Programme* and the *Act on Active Employment Measures*. On a practical level, this means, among other things, showing up for job-counselling and undertaking an internship if that is part of the job-counselling programme:

Legal Extract 4: Declaration of the Aliens Act

Stk. 9. Unless specific reasons speak against it, the grant of permanent residency is conditioned by the alien

- 1) having completed the introduction programme pursuant to the Integration Act, or if that is not the case, has completed another comparable programme, cf. stk. 11,
- 2) having completed specific activities pursuant to § 31 a in the Act on Active Employment Measures, i.e. stk. 11,
- 3) having passed a Danish test approved by the Minister for Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs, cf. stk. 11, and
- 4) not having due debts to the government, cf. stk. 11.

(2008bChapter 1, § 11, Stk. 9)

Thus, the internship interview is not only an important means of access to the labour market; it is furthermore an obligatory element in *The Introduction Programme* and a necessary step in the direction of obtaining a permanent residence permit. In this sense, the immigration status of the internship candidates is a factor that contributes to raising the stakes of the internship interview and potentially influences the actions and behaviour of the participants.

The obligations related to the immigration status of the internship candidate involve obligations related to language skills and language learning. In the same way that the internship can be a way of meeting the employment requirement, it can be a means to achieving a certain level of language proficiency. The language skills of the candidate and the legislative requirements and obligations in that regard are in other words another factor that potentially contributes to making the internship important to the internship candidate and raises the stakes of the internship interview.

Language Skills

The Danish legislation on integration requires all immigrants and refugees to take Danish lessons within approximately a month of arrival and for a period of no more than three years according to the *Integration Act* (2007bChapter 4, § 16). In 2003 the *Act on Danish Courses for Adult Aliens* (*Lov om danskuddannelse til voksne udlændinge m.fl.*) was passed. As part of the act Danish courses for adult aliens were divided into three separate programmes, *Danskuddannelse* (*Danish programme*) 1, 2 and 3. *Danskuddannelse 1 (DU1)* is aimed at people who are illiterate and have received little or no formal education, *DU2* is for people with some level of education and *DU3* is for people with higher education (2003a; Chapter 2, § 3) . The three different *Danish programmes* are all sub-divided into five modules that are each to be completed by taking a test, and the entire programme is completed by passing either *Danish Test 1 (Danskprøve 1)* and *Danish Test 2 (Danskprøve 2)* for *DU1* and *DU2* respectively. *DU3* is completed by passing one of two different tests, *Danish test 3 (Danskprøve 3)* or *Studieprøven (The Study Test)*, the latter of which qualifies the student to go to university or other higher education. The purpose of the Danish programme was, as legislatively stated, to first of all to contribute to the foreigners Danish language competences and their knowledge on Danish culture and society. Secondly, to enable aliens to become familiar with, and integrated into, the Danish labour-market and Danish democracy:

Legal Extract 5: Act on Danish Courses for Adult Aliens

§ 1. The object of courses in Danish as a second language (Danish courses) is to assist adult aliens, on the basis of their individual backgrounds and integrational goals, in acquiring the necessary Danish language proficiency and knowledge on Danish culture and society so as to make them participating and contributory citizens on equal terms with other citizens of society.

Stk. 2. The Danish courses must assist adult aliens in acquiring skills in comprehending and using the Danish language and obtaining knowledge of so as to enable them to get employment and support themselves.

Stk. 3. The Danish courses must also further adult aliens' active use of the Danish language and assist them in obtaining common skills and knowledge which are relevant in relation to working life and education and life as citizens of a democratic society.

(2003a)

Apart from being an explicit and obligatory element of the introduction programme, the passing of *Danish test 3* has recently become a requirement of achieving Danish citizenship (2006b). In this sense language skills are a principal issue for those internship candidates participating in the Introduction Programme as well as for those potentially aspiring to becoming Danish citizens. Furthermore, it is a relevant contextual factor for all of the participants to the extent that they have all, except the one participating in project UNO, been placed in job-counselling programmes specifically designed for people with problems other than unemployment, such as language difficulties and the internship is a strategy used to overcome such problems. It should be noted, however, that the candidates in this study had all completed at least one year of language training, and many of them had passed either *Danish test 2* or *3* or had completed module 4 or 5. This raises some interesting questions about the process of referral to the specialized job-counselling programmes and about notions of 'language difficulties' or 'problems besides unemployment'. Though the logic of placing people who have passed Danish test 2 and 3 in special job-counselling programmes for people with language difficulties or other problems besides unemployment may be challenged, this does not change the fact that language skills were a prevalent part of the broader context of the internship interviews and were continually made relevant by the participants in the actual interactions.

History of Employment/Unemployment

All of the participants in this study are involved in the various job-programmes due to their status of unemployment, and most of them receive some form of financial support from either the government or a union. Hence, they are complying with the *Active Social Policy Act (Lov om en aktiv socialpolitik)*, which means that they are obliged to accept any activation offer from either the municipality, *AF* or the external job consultants in order to receive the support (2005aChapter 4, § 13). This is in itself a reason and a motivating factor for participating in the job-programme and for accepting the internship offered by the job consultants. In addition, for those candidates who are not union members there is also a financial incentive involved, as the welfare benefits they receive are much lower than the amount offered to Danish citizens in comparable social situations. Only Danish citizens, or people who have resided in Denmark for at least seven years total within the last eight years, qualify for full welfare benefits (2005aChapter 4, § 11, stk. 3). Consequently, some of the participants receive a drastically

reduced amount of money. The rationale behind this arrangement is that the reduced welfare benefits will increase the motivation for a regular job and financial independence. The reduced welfare benefits have been strongly criticised for being inadequate, and critics argue that beneficiaries are unable to sustain a decent standard of living. Whether this is in fact conducive to getting a regular job and whether it is a justifiable means to this end is a question that will not be addressed nor answered here, but it is most likely to increase the pressure on the internship candidates and raise the stakes of the internship interview.

Furthermore, it should be noted that people, who are not Danish citizens, EU citizens or a family member of one or the other, and who receive financial support for a period longer than six months may be deported, unless they have lived here for more than seven years. For refugees and others covered by the *Integration Act*, this rule is not effectuated until the three-year introduction period has ended (2005a). The decision of whether or not a person may be deported is made in consideration of whether 1) s/he is a refugee, a legal alien who has been in the country for more than 7 years, or is married to a Danish citizen, 2) the duration of the persons' residence in the country, 3) health issues, 4), the family and other ties to Denmark compared to the home country, and 5) whether another person who has agreed to provide for this person is or should be fulfilling this duty (2005aChapter 2, § 3, stk. 6). Thus, the internship candidates are influenced by a range of incentives that include many other factors than financial motivation for achieving ordinary employment and for undertaking the internship as a means to this end.

Regardless of whether the internship candidates are familiar with or affected by the rules and regulations about their financial situation and their status as unemployed immigrants it seems safe to assume that this situation and status is associated with a great deal of pressure. In sum, these elements may be viewed as an aggregate of motivating factors in relation to succeeding with the interview and getting the internship. This is reflected in the orientations of the candidates towards the interview as a high-stakes evaluative and gatekeeping encounter, which will be further explored and illustrated in section 2.2.2.

In this section I have described different factors that characterise the broader context of the internship and the internship interview. I have, however, refrained from describing their concrete manifestation in the structure of the internship interviews, since this is an empirical matter, which can only be properly described through micro-analysis. The perspective will now change from this more overall contextual outline to a more fine-grained and detailed

investigation of the moment-to-moment structuring and organisation of the internship interview by the participants. This investigation will explore the context of the internship and the internship interview further as it is made relevant and oriented to by the participants, which will solidify and anchor the observations made so far.

2.2 The structuring of the Internship Interview

Thus far I have contextualised the internship interview by looking at it from the outside as a *communicative event* that is embedded in, and potentially influenced by, a legislative, social, structural, economic and administrative framework. In this section, I will focus on the actual doings and sayings of the participants and from this perspective describe the establishment, structuring and organisation of the internship interview and its participants. This is in no way to suggest that the former perspective is to be disregarded or replaced by the latter. A lot of the contextual knowledge and background presented above is accessible to all or some of the participants in the internship interview and is in this way potentially a resource in the interpretation and production of the individual utterances and the interaction as a whole. But in the following I will focus on how the participants themselves construct and orient to the internship interview as a specific form of interaction and what roles and statuses they themselves establish and make relevant. Inspired by Goffman, I start out by looking at how the participants establish and orient to the *participation framework* of the interaction, i.e. how the participants orient to and establish the various participant roles in the interaction. These roles are defined dynamically according to the different forms, functions and stances of participation enacted by the interactants. Secondly, I will describe the internship interview using Hymes' concept of the *speech situation*, which involves looking at the way the participants define and establish the setting of the various interviews through their orientations towards specific goals and strategies. Finally, I will look at the various *speech events* of the internship interview. This involves characterising the interactions in relation to certain institutionalised and recognisable types of interactions or culturally familiar *institutional events* whose organisational traits can be seen to influence the structure and organisation of the internship interview.

The analytical and theoretical perspective in this section is primarily interactional, but its structure is built around concepts and notions from sociolinguistics and linguistic ethnography that are not always used explicitly and in fact often avoided within a conversation analytical or ethnomethodological framework. While the aim is to capture the dynamic and complex structuring process of the internship interview, the use of these concepts supports the

description of some of the more general traits and characteristics that crystallise when looking across several interviews.

2.2.1 The Participation Framework

Erving Goffman employs the concept of *Participation framework* (Goffman 1981) to criticize and refine the notion of ‘speaker’ and ‘hearer’ as the participants in interaction that imply a one-directional and simplistic form of communication. Goffman argues that these notions are too unsophisticated to capture the various forms, functions and stances of interactional participation. He suggests that the participation status of any member of a social gathering should not be based on preconceived notions but should rather be established through empirically based analysis of specific utterances:

Finally, observe that if one starts with a particular individual in the act of speaking – a cross-sectional instantaneous view- one can describe the role or function of all the several members of the encompassing social gathering from this point of reference (whether they are ratified participants of the talk or not), couching the description in the concepts that have been reviewed. The relation of any one such member to this utterance can be called his “participation status” relative to it, and that of all the persons in the gathering the “participation framework” for that moment of speech (Goffman 1981:137).

This notion of participation status and participation framework suggests an interactional context, which is fluid and potentially changing with every utterance leaving the mutual expectations of the other participants susceptible to challenge and redefinition. Goffman elaborates on the notion of participation framework and participation status by extending their application to the broader context of the situation as a whole:

The same two terms can be employed when the point of reference is shifted from a given particular speaker to something wider: all the activity in the situation itself. The point of all this, of course, is that an utterance does not carve up the world beyond the speaker into precisely two parts, recipients and non-recipients, but rather opens up an array of structurally differentiated possibilities, establishing the participation framework in which the speaker will be guiding his delivery (Ibid.)

This means that the participation status of the interlocutors in the internship interview can be established by simultaneously looking at firstly, how specific utterances position the participants in specific ways and make various roles and statuses relevant, and secondly by considering utterances in relation to the situation as a totality of various activities. In order to describe the participation framework of the internship interview, it is, in other words, not

sufficient or accurate to merely list them according to specific etic social categories such as woman, man, immigrant or according to identifiers such as names, numbers, letters and so on since neither of this will tell us anything about the activities, roles, or statuses at play. On the other hand, it would be equally inaccurate and insufficient to identify the participants with categories such as employer, intern, interviewer etc., since this would potentially overemphasise and solidify the various functions, roles and statuses being established and negotiated with every turn and action. The participation framework of the internship interviews must be determined through a movement of perspective from the immediate utterances of the participants and the activity as a whole. This is very much the perspective exercised within conversation analysis and ethnomethodology.

During the internship interviews many different participant roles are constructed and oriented to by the participants, but the most central and recurrent ones are those linked to the central activity in the situation, viz. the interviewing of the intern for the internship. While these roles are locally established, defined and challenged throughout the interviews, they can be said to be potentially established already in the arrangement and the setup of the interview and via the expectations of the participants regarding the purpose of the interaction. At the very beginning of the interviews there is, in other words, an initial and temporary establishment of the participants with an Internship candidate, who is applying for an internship, an Employer, who will potentially take on the candidate, a Job consultant, who is in charge of the job-counselling programme that the candidate is partaking in. In some of the interviews there is an additional participant, namely an Employee, who works at the company or institution, where the candidate has applied. Furthermore, there is a researcher present as an observer in all except one of the interviews.

These roles are then, from the onset of the interview negotiated, co-constructed and established alongside other categories, functions, roles and statuses in relation to specific utterances and the general activity of the situation. Although the roles and functions of the participants are, as Goffman points out, constantly changing according to the activities and actions of the participants, I have chosen to identify the participants in the transcript according to the initially established roles, namely Internship candidate (IN), Employer (HO), Job consultant (CO) and employee (EM). However, this does not always represent the activities or categories that the participants themselves make relevant and orient to at any given time in the

interaction. This may mislead the reader and conceal some of the complexities of the interactions, but unfortunately this is an inevitable side-effect of representation. I have attempted to remedy the potential risk of simplification by investigating how the categories are established and given meaning by the participants, and how they are also challenged and substituted throughout the interaction by other categories and roles.

The central purpose of this section is to describe the establishment and organisation of the participation framework. Consequently, the participant statuses and roles linked to the activities related to the actual internship interview will constitute the focal concern. One of the main arguments of this dissertation is that the activities and participant roles related to the internship interview are closely enmeshed with other activities and not least other participant categorisations, such as second-language speaker, Muslim, Colombian etc. Such categories cannot be described as roles since they are broader in scope and cannot be pinned to a specific activity such as doing interviewing or making a self-presentation. Rather they are categories that are made relevant in relation to a range of different activities and inform and influence the development of the interaction in more subtle ways. In the literature, such categories are often referred to as identities or social identities, but in this dissertation I employ the term membership categories or social categories in order to highlight their properties as interactional constructs and means. They will be discussed further theoretically in chapter 3 and examined analytically in chapter 5.

A good place to begin an examination of the participation framework is the onset of the interactions, where the participants present themselves and their role in the interaction and construct and orient to the purpose of the interaction as such. The following extract is an example of this. As described in section 2.2.1 the participants comprise the employer (HO), the employee (EM), the internship candidate (IN), the job consultant (CO), and the researcher (LO).

Extract 1: Intro 1

13 HO: Nå men det var jo dejligt det kunne komme så hurtigt i stand
14 well it was great that it could be arranged so quickly
15
16 CO: ja det gik stærkt lige pludselig
17 Yes it went quickly all of a sudden
18
19 HO: ja
20 yes
21
22 CO: men sådan er det jo nogen gange
23 but that is the way it is sometimes
24
25 HO: nå men velkommen til
26 well welcome
27
28 IN: tak skal du have
29 thank you
30
31 CO: tak ska du have
32 thank you
33
34 LO: °tak°
35 °thanks°
36
37 HO: åh hhh ja hhh jeg hedder Tina Skov og jeg er sekretariatsleder
38 herinde øøhm Paul?
39
40 and hhh yes hhh my name is Tina Skov and I am leader of secretariat
41 in here eehm Paul?
42 (2.1)
43 EM: ja det er mig der (0.8) står for køkken og madlavning og
44 frivillige og ja den mobile cafe som sådan og alt det der
45 foregår der
46
47 yes it is me who (0.8) is in charge of kitchen and cooking and
48 volunteers and yes the mobile cafe as such and all that
49 goes on there
50 (0.5)
51
52 EM: og det er jo så der hvor (0.4) du skal være
53 and that is then where (0.4) you will be
54
55 IN: ja hehe
56 yes hehe
57
58 EM: være med
59 be with
60
61 IN: det håber jeg [he he he .hh
62 I hope so [he he he .hh
63
64 [ha ha ha .hh
65 [ha ha ha .hh
66 HO: Jeg vil lige starte med [at]fortælle helt kort om Projekt Udenfor
67 I will just begin by [telling very briefly about Projekt Udenfor
68

One of the first things to notice in this extract is that it is introduced by HO who takes the role of initiating the interaction by commenting on the circumstances of the arrangement of the interview. It should be mentioned that prior to this extract there has been a rather long sequence in which the initial hellos are exchanged as people take their seats and pour coffee. This sequence has been left out, since the part of the exchange shown in this extract can be said to represent the actual beginning of the interview, marked by the ‘nå’ (well) in line 13, uttered by HO. Notwithstanding the potential importance of such initial small-talk sequences, I have chosen to focus on the establishment of the more formalized part of the interaction. The one responding to HO’s initial utterance about the interview is the job consultant, who in line 16

recognises that he is the one who has contributed to its arrangement. In line 22 he adds to this recognition with the statement 'men sådan er det jo nogen gange' ('but that is the way it is sometimes'), which brings attention to the fact that this internship interview is not the first one he has arranged and this establishes his role and position as the job consultant. In line 25 HO once again marks the beginning of the interview by a 'nå' ('well') and welcomes the participants, hereby orienting to and establishing her role as the host and the one in charge of the interview.

The order in which the other participants respond to this welcome indicates their different participatory status regarding the purpose of the interaction and the Employer. First we have the response from IN, who hereby places herself as the main recipient of the welcome, followed by CO who hereby identifies himself as a secondary participant and finally by LO, who displays a more marginal participatory status by giving a briefer and quieter response. EM does not respond at all, which shows that he does not consider himself to be a recipient of the welcome and aligns him with the position of HO, i.e. with her role as host.

At this early point in the interaction the roles have been distributed and established so that there are two people hosting the interaction, namely HO and EM and three people being there on invitation, namely IN, CO and LO where CO has contributed to the arrangement of the interaction and LO is a less central figure. In the following utterance in line 37 these roles are further elaborated and defined, as HO presents her function as an employee as well as her status of leader and gives the floor to EM, hereby presenting him as a fellow host and simultaneously indicating his subordinate employment status and once again demonstrating her right to determine the order of speaking.

EM acknowledges this right and responds to her invitation by presenting himself and his area of responsibility. He describes the work he administers and links this to the purpose of the interaction, i.e. the internship, by stating 'og det er jo så der hvor du skal være' ('and that is where you will be') in line 52. Hereby he orients to the interaction as being about the future internship of IN, an orientation that is acknowledged and confirmed by IN's claim to reciprocity in line 55, and he establishes his own role as a central participant in the interaction by claiming responsibility and knowledge about the area of work that IN will be doing.

In line 58 EM makes a specification that can be read as a repair of his previous utterance, which could be understood as if IN would be working in the kitchen in his place and not, as turns out to be the case, 'be with' EM in the kitchen. In line 61 IN orients to the interaction as

an interview in which it will be decided whether she will get the internship or not and acknowledges and constructs EM's position as a representative of the employers and the decision maker in the interaction. While EM shows an orientation to the internship as being already planned and hereby to the interaction as merely a more introductory and informal event, the intern orients to the interaction as a gatekeeping event where the future reality of the internship is to be decided.

In the final utterance in the extract, HO avoids responding to and thereby confirming either of these positions and postpones the decision-making issue by establishing a presentation of the work-place as the first step in the interaction. She hereby again demonstrates her capacity to determine the development and activities of the interaction, determine in what order they are to occur and distribute the right to speak.

The distribution of the roles, rights to talk, and the activities described so far are not exclusive to this first extract. As shown in the following extract they were similarly constructed and effectuated in other interviews as well.

Extract 2: Intro 2

13
14 HO: Men øøhm [ja] men velkommen hertil↓
15 But eehm [yes] but welcome here↓
16
17 EM: [ja]
18 [yes]
19 (0.3)
20 IN: Tak skal du hah. .hh
21 Thank you hah. .hh
22 (0.2)
23 HO: Og jeg vil da starte med at sige til dig hvis der er- jeg
24 siger noget du ikke forstår
25
26 And I will begin by saying to you if there is I
27 say something you don't understand
28 (0.6)
29 HO: Så skal du sige det til mig ikke↑
30 Then you must tell me right↑
31
32 (0.5)
33 HO: Med det samme der er ingen grund til vi fortsætter
34 Right away there is no reason for us to continue
35 (0.4)
36 HO: og du så e:h (sound of a click)
37 and you then e:h
38 (0.6)
39 HO: ikke forstår hvad det er jeg [siger]
40 not understand what it is I am [saying]
41
42 IN: [okay-]
43 [okay-]
44 (0.7)
45 (IN:) (okay)
46

47 HO: Jeg hedder Lise Søgaard
 48 My name is Lise Søgaard
 49 (0.2)
 50 HO: og jeg er souschef her i huset
 51 and I am deputy head here in the house
 52 (0.3)
 53 HO: Og det er Lizzie Kaspersen vi har med
 54 and this is Lizzie Kaspersen we have with us
 55
 56 EM: .hjaa
 57 .hjaa
 58 (0.3)
 59 HO: Og Lizzie er
 60 and Lizzie is
 61 (0.6)
 62 HO: gruppeleder
 63 head of division
 64 (0.7)
 65 HO: i den
 66 in the
 67 (0.3)
 68 HO: gruppe
 69 group
 70 (0.3)
 71 HO: der er tale om du eventuelt skal i praktik
 72 there is talk about you potentially will do an internship
 73
 74 IN: okay
 75 okay
 76 (0.3)
 77 HO: Ja
 78 yes
 79 (0.9)
 80 HO: ja
 81 yes
 82 (0.8)
 83 HO: Men tak for din ansøgning jeg har (fået/flot) .hh
 84 But thank you for your application I have (received/great) .hh
 85
 86 IN: .mlhh selv [tak]
 87 .mlhh you're [welcome]
 88 HO: [såå]em
 89 [soo]em
 90 (0.6)
 91 HO: Nu må vi jo- se
 92 Now we will have to see
 93 (0.6)
 94 HO: Ja
 95 yes
 96 .
 97 .
 98 .
 99 .
 100 HO: Kender du noget til vores plejehjem
 101 Do you know anything about our residential home
 102 (.)
 103

In this extract, as in the previous one, we have HO initiating the interview with a welcome and IN responding to this invitation. After this HO presents herself as the head and EM as a subordinate employee, who is in charge of the area in which IN will be working, hereby also orienting to IN as the future intern. In this case, however, it is HO who emphasises in line 71 and 91 that the decision regarding the internship has not yet been made and thereby constructs the interaction as a gatekeeping interaction in which the primary goal is assessment and decision making. The final utterance in the extract shows a similar transition from an introductory welcome sequence in which the purpose of the interaction and the participants' roles are being established to an introductory presentation sequence, led and initiated by HO.

There are two major differences between this extract and the previous however; first of all, the absence of the job consultant as one of the parties being addressed and participating in

the introductory sequence. This absence might have been caused by the fact that the job consultant does not respond to the welcome by HO and in this respect establishes a less central position for herself from the beginning of the interaction. This is made possible by the fact that the job consultant has not previously, as in the first extract, been addressed directly by HO and is therefore perhaps less available as a recipient of the welcome or may at least more easily decline reciprocity.

The other major difference is that the initial welcome by HO is immediately followed by an orientation by the employer towards the language competences of the internship candidate which adds another dimension to the construction of IN's participant status as internship candidate. As we can see in 23, HO immediately follows up on her welcome with an inserted normative proclamation in which she emphasises that if there is something IN does not understand, she must tell her right away. In this sense HO is using her position as the one orchestrating the interaction to formulate some ground rules for the interaction regarding IN's behaviour in case of problems of understanding. She is hereby simultaneously establishing IN as belonging to a category of speakers that may have problems with understanding. IN does not immediately respond to HO's request for confirmation in line 29, so HO continues with an reformulation that further allows and invites the contribution and response from IN, especially during the longer pauses in line 35 and 38 and the hesitation in line 36. This prompts IN to finally respond, first in overlap in line 42 and finally in line 45. This topicalisation of language has the consequence of establishing and making the category of second-language speaker relevant and of placing this category centrally in relation to some of the other participant statuses and membership categories that are later introduced as part of the actual introduction sequence.

In section 5.4 I will examine some other examples of how the category of second language speaker is made relevant throughout the various interviews and how this influences the interaction. However, in relation to the question of the participation framework, this example presents a good illustration of how the role of the internship candidate is intimately linked with other categories made relevant by the other participants. Furthermore, it presents a good example of how the right and power to define the different roles and positions within the interaction is to some extent defined by the distribution of rights to talk and control the interaction, which again is linked to the role of host and employer. The fact that the interaction is taking place at the work-place, where the internship candidate will potentially work can be

said to further establish the rights to control the interaction which usually comes with being the employer. One can speculate that these rights could have been distributed differently, if the interaction had taken place at another place, e.g. the job consultant's office. This would, however, only be conceivable, if the internship interview was not a site for assessment and decision making but rather one of planning and organizing. In the second extract the interaction is established as an interview in which the internship candidate is to be accepted or rejected. This seems to entail a conflation of the roles of employer and host and the attribution of rights to this category of rights to control and define the activities of the interaction and the roles of the participants.

So far the examples have illustrated the initial and overall establishment of the participants' roles in relation to one of the central activities of the interaction, namely the interviewing of the internship candidate and the decision-making process regarding the prospect and organisation of the internship. This has revealed some patterns regarding the overall order of control and distribution of rights to speak between the participants. The role and actions of the employers have been central to the presentation and definition of the participation framework so far. Their participation have been shown to establish their role as hosts of the interaction, their superior position at the work-place and the responsibility/privilege of being the decision-maker that goes with it.

Another central figure in the internship interviews, who is also making claims to the right to define and control the interaction, is the job consultant. The following extract is an example of this:

Extract 3: Tell about yourself

```

317 IN:      [(
318 CO:      [Ka du ikke prøve] at fortælle lidt om dig selv selma måske
319          [can you not try] to tell a little about yourself selma maybe
320 (0.5)
321 CO:      *Hvad du har lavet før*
322          *what you have done before*
323
324 IN:      ja jeg har haft en øh øh hvad hedder det jeg har haft eeh arbejde
325          på hotel (.) Merkur og (Hortsmund)
326
327          yes I have had a eh ehh what is it called I have had eeh job
328          at hotel (.) Merkur and (Hortsmund)
329
330 HO:      ja
331          yes
332
333 IN:      Jeg starter som køkkenmedhjælp ( ) morgenmad fra klokken seks til
334          tolv
335
336          I begin as kitchen help ( ) breakfast from six o'clock to
337          twelve
338
339 HO:      okay
340          okay

```


This extract illustrates one of the common functions and roles of the job consultant namely of encouraging the internship candidate to participate and contribute. The extract follows a rather long description by the employer of the area in which IN will be working and the different tasks that will be involved. The internship candidate has responded to this by saying that these tasks are not a problem for her since she has experience with them from previous work and from having four children.

The job consultant takes the floor in line 318, overlapping with the internship candidate, and asks her to tell a little about herself. In line 321, he specifies what he is after, namely her previous work experience. He hereby establishes his role as a consultant for IN and his position and rights as one of the people in control of the development and the content of the interaction. IN acknowledges and legitimizes this position and role by responding to his encouragement, and HO co-operates in securing the suggested development of the interaction by claiming reciprocity to IN's response. In other words, HO acknowledges and displays understanding of the fact that CO is requesting the information about IN on behalf of the other participants, and in this manner she co-constructs his position as an advocate or consultant for IN and an assisting figure for HO and EM in the interaction and the process of planning the internship.

Another way in which the job consultant establishes and orients to this binary role of advocate for the internship candidate and assistant for the employer is through the activity of presenting the job-counselling programme that s/he and the internship candidate are both involved in. The following extract is an example of this:

Extract 4: It is your conversation but

448 HO: okay
449 okay
450
451 CO: Det ku være jeg være jeg sku prøve at sige lidt også bare sådan lige
452 It could be I be I should try to say a little also just like
453
454 EM: ja
455 yes
456
457 CO: Ellers det er fint det jo i skal jo bare det jo jeres hø hø
458 samtale men
459
460 otherwise it is fine it is you know you should you know just it is
461 you know your he he conversation but
462 (.)
463 CO: nu har jeg ikke snakket med dig før Brian
464 now I have not talked to you before Brian
465
466 EM: ne[j
467 n[o
468
469 CO: [øøhm
470 [eehm
471
472 CO: sådan helt kort fortalt jeg vil bare sige at- at det vi laver ude
473 på væksthuse det er at vi lave:r .hh vi hjælper folk med at komme
474 i arbejde
475
476 CO: very briefly I will just say that- that what we do out
477 in væksthuse it is that we do: .hh we help people get employed
478
479 EM: mmm
480
481 CO: Groft sagt øøh og den afdeling jeg sidder i har med indvandrere at
482 gøre
483
484 CO: Crudely speaking eeh and the department I am sitting in deals
485 with immigrants
486 (.)

As we can see from this extract the position and role of the job consultant is not only ambiguous and divided in relation to the internship candidate and the employer, it is also conflicted in relation to his visibility in and control over the interaction.

On the one hand the job consultant demonstrates and establishes his central position in, and control over, the interaction in line 451 by taking the floor and steering the development of the interaction in a certain direction. Previous to his utterance in line 451 the conversation has revolved around the obligations of the internship candidate with respect to picking up and dropping off her children and how the work hours of the internship could be planned accordingly. This topic is signalled to be potentially closed by HO in line 448, and CO uses this transition as a relevant place to introduce a new topic and a new distribution of talk with himself as the main speaker.

On the other hand, CO displays an orientation towards the imposition of taking control of the topical development and the distribution of talk by the mitigating and apologetic phrasing in the beginning of his utterance, which conversation analysts describe as a *pre-face*. *Pre-faces* have a range of different functions depending on the sequential environment in which they occur. Schegloff (1980; 1982) describes how pre-faces are used in the coordination of

irregularities in the turn-taking system for example in relation to the telling of stories, which involves extended turns at talk.

This is also described by Kjærbeck (1998b) in her study of Danish and Mexican business-meetings. She argues that the pre-face can be used to signal that an extended unit of talk will follow, which makes the listeners orient to the speaker's right to finish his or her talk without taking the floor in places where it would otherwise be possible and expected.

Kjærbeck (1998b:80) furthermore argues that pre-faces are also regularly used to initiate a shift in topic. She describes how there is a normative expectation among interactants that a topic will continue in the following turn unless otherwise explicitly stated and how pre-faces constitute a response to this expectation in the sense that it signals a subsequent topic breach.

Finally, Heritage (1984b:267) describes how people regularly use pre-faces for dispreferred actions, i.e. actions that are formatted in ways that display an orientation towards that action being alternative to that which is projected and normatively expected from the previous action. Dispreferred actions in this way refer to a way of speaking and formatting a response and not to the desires of the participants. Heritage states that dispreferred actions are normally disaffiliative while preferred actions are usually affiliative, or as Heritage formulates it:

In sum, preferred format actions are normally affiliative in character while dispreferred format actions are disaffiliative. Similarly, while preferred format actions are generally supportive of social solidarity, dispreferred format actions are destructive of it. As we shall see, the uniform recruitment of specific features of turn design to preferred and dispreferred action types is probably related to their affiliative and disaffiliative characters. (Heritage 1984b:269)

In the present example, the pre-face combined with the hesitation and the restarts found in the beginning of CO's utterance can be viewed as an orientation towards an irregularity in the turn-taking order and a mitigation of the imposition of his behaviour. CO here receives a confirmative and encouraging response from EM, who prompts him to continue, which shows that EM recognises and supports the position CO is claiming for himself. However, in line 457 CO makes another pre-face in which he even more explicitly renounces control of the interaction by stating that it is 'your conversation'. By inserting a 'but' at the end of line 458 he demonstrates that he is not giving the floor back to the other participants. Hence, CO once again displays an orientation to a 'regular' turn-taking order and distribution of rights to talk and mitigating the violation of this order that his claim to the floor and his topic initiation

represents. He accounts for his behaviour by bringing attention to the fact that he has not talked to the employee before, which simultaneously makes EM the recipient of his talk and legitimizes his interruption as a special case. Once again EM gives him the opportunity to continue by acknowledging his explanation minimally and recognizing and allowing that something is to follow. In line 472 CO then finally launches into the multi-unit-turn description that he has signalled was to come and has carefully prepared the space for, i.e. a presentation of the function of the job-counselling programme he represents and thereby his role in the interaction.

There are two central aspects of this function, namely ‘helping people get employed’ and ‘dealing with immigrants’. I will not go further into the details of this description here, since what is central to this extract in relation to the participation framework is the way it illustrates the role and position of the job consultant. As shown, this is established in relation to on the one hand the employer and the employee who are otherwise constructing themselves as the ones hosting and controlling the interaction and on the other hand the intern. S/he is constructed as the other key participant and is, as illustrated above, generally encouraged to participate and contribute.

This and the previous extract show how the job consultant establishes his role as the representative and advocate of IN as well as the assistant and support of EM and HO. This manifests itself in the activities and interactional functions that CO undertakes in the two extracts shown and in the distribution and organisation of the right to speak. As is particularly evident in the second extract, the internship interview demands a balancing act between the different responsibilities of the job consultant. On the one hand, s/he is to be invisible enough to allow for the interaction and participation of the other participants. On the other, s/he has to simultaneously encourage the internship candidate to contribute and demonstrate availability and security in relation to the employer and the employee with respect to arranging the internship.

Thus far the investigation of the participation framework of the internship interview has focused primarily on the roles, positions and activities of the employer, the employee and not least the job consultant. A central element in this context has been to examine the way they negotiate the right to talk, to distribute talk, and to control the topical development of the interaction. Though it would seem fair to presume that the candidate would be the most central

participant in the internship interview, this is not the case. The internship candidate turns out to be the main topic of discussion rather than the main discussant.

The actual participation of the candidate is often quite limited and in many cases the other participants take over by acting or speaking on the candidate's behalf. This confirms and supports the distribution of the right to speak and control the interaction as illustrated above. In many of the interviews, there are long sequences of talk between the employer, the employee and the job consultant about the internship or the internship candidate during which the internship candidate is silent and not participating. This is also made possible by the fact that the internship interview is not a two-party but rather a multi-party interaction. This will necessarily change the turn-organisation and allow for some of the participants, in these cases the internship candidate, to renounce reciprocity and it enables the willing or unwilling inclusion or exclusion of some participants at specific times during the interaction.

The following extract, which is from a different interview than the former, is an example of one of the instances in which the employer and the job consultant are interacting on behalf of the internship candidate without including him/her.

Extract 5: Planning the Internship

26
30 CO:hh øøh så det vil sige vi følger jo så praktikken og har
31 også lavet nogen redskaber som jeg vil vende tilbage til
32 .hh som jeg regner med i vil [prøve
33
34hh eeh so that means we then follow the
35 internship and have also made some tools that I will return to .hh
36 that I expect you to [try
37 HO: [hvilket tidsrum er praktikken
38 [what timespan is the internship
39
40 CO: den er tolv uger
41 it is twelve weeks
42 (0.7)
43 HO: tolv uger tre måneder
44 twelve weeks three months
45 (0.3)
46 CO: ja
47 yes
48
49 HO: ja
50 yes
51 (0.5)
52 CO: øøh
53 eeh
54
55 HO: Med mulighed for forlængelse
56 with the possibility of extension

The first thirty seconds of the interaction have been left out, but consisted of one, long uninterrupted turn by the job consultant that finishes in line 30 of the extract. In this turn the job consultant presents the job-counselling project she is involved in. This utterance by the job consultant marks the beginning of the internship interview and the beginning of an

approximately 6 minute long sequence of interaction in which the job consultant and the employer are more or less the only ones contributing. The sequence revolves around the terms, obligations and possibilities of the internship with regards to the legislative and bureaucratic framework. There is an element of bargaining, which is emphasised by the absence of the internship candidate.

As the extract shows, CO is addressing the employer, who acknowledges reciprocity in line 37 by requesting additional information about the time span of the internship. Although the candidate presumably might have provided these answers just as easily, it is the job consultant who self-selects as next speaker and answers. Once the duration of the internship has been settled, CO initiates another turn in line 52 but does not follow this through, and HO takes this as an opportunity to probe the possibilities for extending the internship beyond the planned duration.

The extract illustrates one of the many situations in which the internship candidate is not included or oriented to as the next relevant speaker by the employer or the job consultant, who co-construct themselves as the key participants and the ones in charge of planning and deciding on the terms and organisation of the internship. The sequence continues along very similar lines for approximately six minutes during which no introduction of, or conversation with, the internship candidate takes place. There are only three times during this sequence in which the candidate is either addressed or selecting herself as the next speaker. However, all three instances are very brief and merely have the function of confirming what has already been stated or established by HO and CO. The following extract is the first example of this:

Extract 6: You Don't Receive Public Support

83 CO: øh fordi altså som udgangspunkt er det tolv uger det er også noget
84 med hvad man må i forhold til loven fordi de tilhører så en gruppe
85 af selvforsørgende som er en lidt speciel gruppe (0.5)
86 fordi de modtager ikke offentlige ydelser eller du modtager ikke
87 offentlige ydelser og det gør så at der er nogle særlige regler .hah
88 .hh [ja
89
90 eh because that is as a starting point it is twelve weeks that
91 is also something to do with what one can do under the law
92 because they belong to a group of self-supporting which is a
93 somewhat special group (0.5) because they do not receive public
94 support or you do not receive public support and this then means
95 that there are some special rules .hah
96 .hh [ja
97
98 HO: [modtager du ikke offentlige ydelser
99 [you do not receive public support
100 (0.2)
101 IN: absolut ikke (.) .hehm
102 absolutely not (.) .hehm
103
104 HO: fordi du: [hvorfor
105 because you: [why
106
107 CO: [det f-
108 [it c-
109
110 CO: fordi det er dem der s- familiesammenførte ik' hvis din ægtefælle
111 because it is those who s- familyunited right if your spouse
112
113 CO: [skal så ku garantere]
114 [must then be able to guarantee]
115
116 HO: [nå fordi du: øh] fordi du er gift
117 [ah because you: eh] because you are married
118
119 IN: ja
120 yes
121

This extract is an example of one of the instances during the first six minutes of the interaction where the internship candidate is addressed and constructed as a next relevant speaker and is thus oriented to and established as part of the participation framework. This inclusion takes place in line 98, where HO formulates and addresses a question at IN based on the information previously provided by CO about IN's membership of the category self-supporting.

The discussion of this group, and the implications for the internship of IN's status as a member of this group, is initially formulated in general terms by CO in line 84 and 86 (92 and 93 in the translation). She uses the pronoun 'they', but as she rephrases it using the pronoun 'you' immediately after also in line 86 (94 in the translation), she is orienting to and recognizing the internship candidate's presence in the participation framework. This paves the way for HO addressing the candidate directly in line 98.

A side-effect of his probing is that IN by CO are implicitly addressed in the explicit request for a response. In line 101 IN claims reciprocity of HO's question and immediately displays that she has understood and followed everything that has been discussed about the issue. By using the emphatic expression 'absolutely not' and by adding the laughing sounds, she not only accepts and confirms the categorisation of herself as self-supporting but distances herself from the alternative potentially implied, namely that she belongs to the category of

unemployed immigrants on welfare. However, in line 104 HO indicates that she does not understand why IN does not receive financial support and she seeks additional information or an elaboration of IN's response with the utterance 'because you:'. The unfinished sentence calls for completion and HO specifies that it is to come from IN. However, CO claims reciprocity and self-selects as next relevant speaker by overlapping the last 'why' by HO. Upon realizing the overlap, CO restarts and provides the additional information that answers HO's question and clarifies the reasons for IN's self-sufficiency.

While the question by HO had the function of keeping IN involved and participating in the discussion, CO's answer on behalf of IN works in the opposite direction and re-excludes IN as a ratified member of the participation framework. Thus, CO undermines IN's claim to knowledge and information regarding the circumstances and legislative terms of the internship. Instead CO constructs herself as the key figure in the establishment and planning of the internship. However, CO does not completely disregard the presence of the internship candidate, as she changes the third person reference 'those who family reunified' into a second person reference to 'your spouse', which is similar to the indirect address she made in line 86 (94 in translation).

CO thus recognises IN as part of the participation framework but disregards or undermines her right to speak by speaking on her behalf. HO does, however, contribute to establishing IN as a ratified participant by overlapping the final part of CO's utterance in line 116 with a request for confirmation addressed at IN. Here HO picks up on the first person reference and the information provided in CO's previous utterance. HO summarizes the gist of the answer given by CO and redirects it at IN recognising and establishing, as in line 98, herself, rather than CO, as the primary authority of knowledge. Furthermore, this establishes IN as an active participant of the next turn, because the formulation demands an acceptance or a rejection in the next turn.

HO does not, however, in any way question the information and knowledge provided by CO, nor does it challenge her status as a representative of the internship candidate and the legislative or bureaucratic framework of the internship. She merely uses the semiotic resources of 'your spouse' made available in the interaction by CO to orient to IN as a relevant and ratified participant. This means that IN is categorised as someone who has equal access to and authority over the knowledge that CO has provided and made a privileged claim of ownership

to. By seeking confirmation from IN rather than CO, HO is, though momentarily, challenging CO's right and capacity to speak on behalf of IN.

While evening out the asymmetry evoked by CO's initial way of speaking on behalf of the IN, HO is confirming their relation as 'Consultant' and 'Consulted' and their affiliation with, and knowledge of, the welfare system and the legislative framework of immigration. Although IN contributes to establishing and securing her position as a legitimate speaker and participant in the interaction, when the possibility to do so is offered to her, first in line 101 and secondly in line 119, she is prevented in doing so by CO in line 104, where CO takes the opportunity to continue speaking on her behalf. The same thing happens again after the response from IN in line 119, when HO confirms her response and is overlapped by an additional confirmation by CO, who then continues her explanation of the rules of immigration regarding self-sufficiency and the initiatives previously taken with regards to unemployment for the group of self-sufficient immigrants.

Although the extract illustrates an example of a situation in which the internship candidate is to a certain extent included and recognised as a ratified member of the participation framework, it represents an exception from a general tendency found not only within this six minutes sequence or this interaction but in the internship interviews as a whole for the internship candidate to be granted (and accepting) a marginal role in the participation framework. A role of being the one talked about rather than the one talking.

This is not to say that the internship candidate does not negotiate this role and merely accepts being talked about, but generally she, and in fact most of the other internship candidates, can be said to both establish themselves and be established as having a less central participant status. The following extract is another example of this.

Extract 7: So It Has Been a Little Difficult

553
554 CO: =men men men ja altså så: øøh og du ville jo bare have et job
555 men du har så haft det h- det her=
556
557 =but but but yes like so: eeh and you just wanted a job
558 but you have then had this t- this thing=
559
560 IN: =Jeg har skrevet femten ansøgning=
561 =I have written fifteen applications=
562
563 CO: =ja
564 =yes
565 (.)
566 CO: Du har søgt ret meget øhm
567 you have applied quite a lot ehm
568 (.)
569 CO: [men har haft] det her med at at ret meget rengøring det ligger jo
570 [but have had] this thing that that quite a lot of cleaning is
571
572
573 CO: før (.) man skal afleverere børn typisk og sådan noget ik'
574 before (.) one has to drop children off and that right
575
576 EM: ja=
577 yes=
578
579 CO: =så det har været lidt svært [.hhh] øøhm
580 =so that has been a little difficult [.hhh] ehm
581
582 HO: [ja]
583 [yes]
584 (0.2)
585 CO: så. Det er sådan typisk den måde vi arbejder på og så gør vi
586 det at vi overlader det jo som regel helt til arbejdspladsen og
587 praktikanten at finde ud af alt
588
589 so. That is typically the way we work and then we do this
590 that we leave it you know usually completely up to the workplace and
591 the intern to figure out everything
592 (.)
593 CO: ligesom det var et job ik .hh
594 like it was a job right .hh
595
596 HO: mm
597 mm

Just before this extract, CO has given a rather long description of what they as job consultants do as part of the job-counselling project he represents. He has explained how they have helped candidates applying for jobs, establishing the internship and learning how to use the computer to surf for jobs on the internet. IN has responded to this by making a joke about her troubles with handling the mouse, and CO then returns to his activity of describing IN's situation on her behalf. This is where the extract begins.

As we can see, IN's only contribution to this description about her situation is in line 560 where she states that she has written fifteen applications. The job consultant follows up on this with an assessment and an account of what this means and once again engages with the enterprise of explaining the reason for IN's problems with getting a job. In line 569- 573 this problem is described as being a conflict between the working hours of the cleaning jobs that IN has applied for and her responsibility for dropping off her children in the morning. Although CO's contribution works to explicitly address and include IN in the exchange, the formatting

of his turn as an assessment and his immediate return to the initial topic of his role as a job consultant in line 585 diminishes the impact of the inclusion of IN. IN's participant status as a topic and her marginal position in the participation framework is not affected.

It is important to emphasise that although the participation framework of the internship interviews is generally characterised by the dominant role of the job consultant, the employer and the employee as organizers of the internship interview and the more marginal role of the candidate, this does not mean that latter is not contributing or participating at all. In fact, the candidates do, in most of the internship interviews, contribute with descriptions of their previous experience, their motivations for applying for the internship etc. However, their participation is almost always encouraged, invited and initiated by either the job consultant or the employer. I already showed an example of this with extract 3, where the job consultant encouraged the internship candidate Selma to tell about herself, which initiated a longer description by the internship candidate of her previous work-experience. The job consultant's encouragement was not only successful in eliciting a response from the internship candidate; it also successfully created a space where the primary participants were the internship candidate and the employer rather than the job consultant and the employer.

Though not included in the extract selected, the ensuing interaction between HO and IN continues for about 2 minutes without the participation of CO, in which they talk about IN's previous job-experience, her children and her responsibilities with dropping them off and picking them up. In this and other similar sequences, the internship candidates manage to temporarily establish their role as the primary speakers in the participation framework and not only objects of conversation but as primary subjects in the interaction given their candidateship for the internship. This is illustrated in the following extract.

Extract 8: What Would You Like?

141 HO: .hh hvad ku du:: hvad ku du have lyst til at bruge de fire uger til
 142 .hh what would you:: what would you want to use the four weeks for
 143
 144 IN: .HHMM .tsk mm. æ jeg har lyst til at se hvordan arbejdet fungerer
 145 og hvordan de kommunikerer med hinanden som: m-
 146
 147 .HHMM .tsk mm. aa I would like to see how the work works
 148 and how they communicate with each other as: m-
 149
 150 HO: ja
 151 yes
 152
 153 IN: .hh hvordan det der øh .fhh socialrådgivereinget
 154 .hh how that thing eh .fhh socialworkeringt
 155
 156 CO: social og sundhed[()
 157 social and health[()
 158
 159 IN: [social og sundhed hvordan de: mm: øøh: kommunikerer
 160 [social and health how the:y mm: eeh: communicate
 161
 162 med beboerne kan man sige [for]di
 163 with the residents one could say [becau]se
 164
 165 HO: [ja]
 166 [yes]
 167 HO: ja
 168 yes

In this extract HO is orienting to IN as the key participant in the interaction and invites her to express her thoughts and ideas about the internship. By posing a very open ended question, he opens up space for IN to take the answer in the direction she wants and IN responds by giving a very general and somewhat abstract description of her curiosity and interest with regards to the work area she is entering into. In line 153 she uses the wrong term to describe this field of work, namely social worker, but she displays uncertainty about the correctness of the word by doing word-search and by finishing the word on a very high pitch. This elicits a correction from CO that IN then repeats. Contrary to the previous extract 7, IN here establishes herself as, and is being oriented to as, a primary speaker and the function of the job consultant is reduced to offering assistance on request rather than speaking on IN's behalf.

In other cases the internship candidate is addressed directly and oriented to as a ratified and central participant in the interaction but is nevertheless prevented from controlling the direction and the content of the interaction, because the specificity of the employer's questions projects a certain preferred answer. Although the internship candidate in the following example is addressed explicitly and given a lot of interactional room, she does not manage to make her participant status less marginal. This is an example of how the participation framework is not dictated or controlled by any one of the participants, but is constituted through a complicated interplay of actions and opportunities for actions.

Extract 9: What Else Have You Done?

49 HO: så har du arbejdet i- (0.2) i køkkenet?
50 then you have work i- (0.2) in the kitchen?
51 (0.2)
52 IN: ja
53 yes
54
55 (Sound of paper being moved)
56
57 IN: Os jeg arbejdet i opvasker (0.2) i Rigshospitalet
58 Also i have worked in dishwashing (0.2) at Rigshospitalet
59 (0.4)
60 HO: ja opvasker i Rigshospitalet ja?
61 yes dishwasher at Rigshospitalet yes?
62 (1.5)
63 IN: og hvad har du så ellers me:re lavet udover det som vi havde
64 snakket om det her med (0.4) hotel å
65
66 and what have you then otherwise done mo:re besides what we had
67 talked about this thing with (0.4) hotel and
68 (1.4)
69 HO: Du har aldrig prøvet og være ude sån- i (0.6) i hjemmepleje hvis
70 jeg må sige det sådan vel?
71
72 you have never tried to be out like- in (0.6) home help if
73 i can put it that way right?
74 (0.2)
75 IN: nej
76 no
77 (0.4)
78 HO: du har kun været på plejehjem
79 you have only been in residential homes
80

In this example HO asks IN a question in line 49 that projects a positive reply and an elaboration, which IN provides in line 52 and line 57 where she states that she has also worked as a dishwasher in ‘Rigshospitalet’, i.e. the local university hospital. In line 60 HO then affirms and repeats the formulation of IN in a way that requests further elaboration from IN. As this elaboration is not delivered by IN after a 1.5 second pause, HO more explicitly asks IN to describe her previous experience apart from what has already been mentioned. Thus, HO signals that what has been delivered by IN so far has not been sufficient. As IN does not respond after 1.4 seconds pause, HO asks IN more explicitly whether she has any experience with home help services in line 69. The question is formatted in a way that projects a negative response indicating the expectation that IN does not have such experience. Hence, HO finally makes explicit what she seeking, i.e. previous experience with home help services, which is the type of service delivered by the company that HO represents and furthermore displays an orientation towards IN as unable to meet this demand.

In this way the example shows how IN is hand oriented to and established as a central participant in the interaction and is continually selected as next speaker by HO. However, here the participation and contribution of IN is more restricted and controlled by HO, as she is simultaneously establishing her own role as the one controlling the interaction by determining what replies and contributions are valid and satisfactory. The role and the contribution of IN is

thus clearly defined by HO's way of controlling the direction of the interview and IN's answers work more as elements in the development of an argument presented by HO, namely that IN does not have any experience with home help services.

While many of the internship candidates participate and establish themselves as central parts of the participation framework, the extent and form of their participation is very much influenced by the ways in which the job consultant and the employer establish and manage their roles as organizers of the interaction and the internship. Similarly, the participation and roles of the job consultants and the employers are influenced and enabled by the participation of the internship candidates.

Summarizing this section, I have sought to describe and illustrate how the participation framework of the internship interview is dynamically co-constructed between the participants. The examples have illustrated how certain patterns present themselves in the distribution of rights, actions and behaviour between the participants, and how these patterns are generated by the participants' repeated and mutual orientation towards the specific interactional context of the internship interview. Hence, the participants establish the participation framework through their orientations towards the speech situation and vice versa. In the ensuing section, I will describe the participants' orientations and establishment of the speech situation.

2.2.2 The Speech Situation (The Setting)

Examining the structuring of the internship interview involves not only looking at the participants and how they construct and organize their participant roles and functions, but also investigating how they construct and orient to the overall activity they participate in. Although this dimension is mentioned by Goffmann in relation to his notion of participation framework, Hymes notion of speech situation allows for a more concrete conceptualization of this level of organisation. He describes how ongoing activities within a communicative event can be recognisable (at least for some of the participants) as a unit of various activities directed at a specific outcome, such as a fishing trip, lovemaking, a hunt etc. Hymes defines speech situation in the following way:

In a sociolinguistic description, then, it is necessary to deal with activities which are in some recognizable way bounded or integral. From the standpoint of general social description they may be registered as ceremonies, fishing trips, and the like; from particular standpoints they may be regarded as political, esthetic, etc., situations, which serve as contexts for the manifestation of political, esthetic, etc.,

activity. From the sociolinguistic standpoint they may be regarded as speech situations (Hymes 1974:52).

By looking at the participants' structuring and organisation of the internship interview, it is possible to describe how they construct the interaction as a specific speech situation and how they negotiate the common activity (activities) and overall goal(s) of the interaction. In this respect the notion of speech situation is very similar to Levinson's notion of activity types. Whereas Hymes notion of speech situation highlights its recognisability as cultural units, Levinson's notion of activity types is slightly more dynamic in that it emphasises the process of constitution, i.e. the range of goals, actions and strategies of participants in interaction. When characterizing the internship interview as a speech situation, it will be done from the perspective highlighted by Levinson, i.e. through a description of the participants' orientations and actions.

Hymes notion of speech situation, however, has the advantage of highlighting how a given interaction is not just a range of separate activities. Rather it is a situation as a whole, comprising various specific events, in the way that a dinner party, for example, involves both verbal interaction, eating, playing games etc. Hymes notion of speech situation highlights how interactions are culturally situated exchanges that are shaped by not only the activities of its participants but by the cultural and ideological properties that are linked to and created by these activities. One final aspect that should be mentioned when comparing the notion of activity types and speech situation is the different ways in which they describe the rules, restrictions and distribution of rights of participation. While Hymes and Levinson seem to agree that a communicative event entails a set of rules and restrictions, Hymes sees these rules and restrictions as specific to the various speech events that a speech situation can comprise. In contrast, Levinson sees the overall speech situation or activity type as defined by one overall set of rules and constraints. In this respect Hymes' notion makes a more sophisticated characterization of the internship interview possible. Consequently, I prefer the term speech situation over activity type. Moreover, I keep Hymes' distinction between speech situation and speech event, though I adapt Levinson's action-oriented perspective in the characterization of the speech situation. In this section then, I will look at the way the participants orient to and co-construct different goals and activities within the interaction and thereby establish the speech situation of the internship interview. With regards to the specific rules of the internship interview and the restrictions on the participants, I have already touched upon this aspect in

relation to the participation framework and will not discuss this further in relation to the speech situation. I do, however, return to this aspect in the next section 2.2.3 on the different speech events that the speech situation can be said to comprise.

Before moving on to describe the speech situation, there is one aspect of both Levinson's and Hymes' notions that need to be discussed, since it may be said to conflict with an interactional perspective and that is the notion of 'goal'. As mentioned, Levinson and Hymes both describe how a speech situation or activity type should be characterised by looking at the activities, strategies and goals of the participants. However, where the two former are easily identified in talk-in-interaction, the notion of 'goal' is less straightforward to pin down. Like notions such as 'intention' and 'assumption', 'goal' is a term that describes an individual and primarily mental disposition, which is considered to lie behind and determine actions. The problem is that while we can observe actions and describe structures and actions as well as other people's responses to actions, we can only make more or less qualified guesses about the reasons or mental dispositions that lead to certain actions. When using the term goal in the following description of the internship interview as a speech situation, I wish to make no pretences of knowing the intentions or goals behind the participants' actions. Instead, I seek to describe how they individually orient to the overall interactional situation that they are involved in and that they are continually negotiating. The goals of this overall situation, and of the various activities that it comprises, are considered to be interactional accomplishments. They are products of the interaction rather than something determining the interaction. In fact, the point of the following section is to illustrate the hybridity and complexity of the internship interview as a speech situation. This complexity is constituted by the constant negotiation and redefinition by the participants of the goals and purposes of their activities and of their individual roles and statuses.

When describing the way the participants orient to and establish the goals of the internship interview, it is important to emphasise that among the internship interviews I have collected there are two types, the *introductory internship interview*, which amount to a total of nine, and the *follow-up internship interview*, of which I have collected seven. The distinction between the two types of interactions is partially established by the job consultants prior to the actual interview and resonates in the organisation of the job consultants' work and way of talking about the process of arranging the internship.

As the job consultants called me during my data-collection period, to let me know that an interview had been scheduled, they would tell me that it was either an introductory or a follow-up interview. As soon as they had managed to establish an internship, they would immediately plan a follow-up interview to take place halfway through the internship period. Consequently, the distinction between the introductory and the follow-up interview was reflected in the structure and organisation of the job consultants' daily working practice.

Broadly speaking, the *introductory internship interview* was generally constructed and oriented to as an interview situation consisting of the following elements occurring in no specific order: The job consultants' presentation of the job-counselling programme, the employers' and the employees' presentation of the work-place, questions about the applicants interests in the work-place and motivations for wanting the job, descriptions of the relevant tasks and areas of work, and finally practical information and planning of the internship with regards to the time period, work schedule, starting date etc.

The *follow-up internship interview*, on the other hand, was generally constructed and oriented to as an evaluation where the participants would discuss the tasks and work areas of the intern. This would also represent an opportunity to discuss any problems that might have presented themselves during the internship. The participants also use this interaction to plan the final part of the internship and discuss the intern's future plans and possibilities.

Due to the considerable differences between the two types of interviews, I will treat them as distinct categories in the ensuing description of the speech situation. I will focus on the introductory internship interview, since these, as I will argue and illustrate, are situations in which the decision making about the internship and the assessment of the candidate is more recurrent and predominant.

Although the follow-up interviews could potentially constitute an opportunity to discuss the prospects of a job based on the progress of the internship, the employers were in most cases unable to offer a regular job after the internship. Therefore, the follow-up internship interviews were in reality merely a summarizing description of progress of the internship which had no consequences for the future of the candidate. In this sense, the introductory internship interview can be argued to be more consequential and important for the candidate than the follow-up internship interview.

The Introductory Internship Interview

In the introductory internship interview which is where most of the previous extracts are from, the participants orient towards the common overall goal of deciding on the possibilities of a future internship. As illustrated in the previous section, the responsibility for this decision-making, and thereby the role of controlling the interaction, is taken by, and granted to, the employer, which influences the distribution of talk between the participants. While the employer seems to be the one who controls the establishment of the speech situation in the introductory internship interviews, there are differences in how the overall goal and activity of the interaction is established and oriented to.

In some cases the introductory internship interview is being oriented to as if it was a decision-making process, and in other cases as if it was merely a planning meeting where the practicalities are to be settled. Finally, some interviews are oriented to as if they were meant to establish the interests and needs of the internship candidate, and how and whether these can be met. The following first two extracts exemplify the first kind, in which the employer emphasises and orients to the internship as something that has not been decided and agreed upon yet.

Extract 10: That Is To Anticipate That It Can Happen

266
267 HO: Nej men det er jo også st- g- det jo altså det er os- o- foregribe
268 nu .hh
269
270 No but that you know is also st- g- that is you know that is also-
271 to anticipate now .hh
272
273 CO: ja hhh [he he he he he he he he
274 yes hhh[he he he he he he he he
275
276 HO: [at det ka blive til noget men å normalt så ka man sige jo
277 [that it can happen but and normally then one kan say you know
278 (0.8)
279
280 HO: at det ku være et >et længerevarende forløb<=
281 that it could be >a longer period<=
282
283 CO: =ja
284 =yes

In line 267 HO inserts the utterance ‘no but that is you that is also- to anticipate now that it can happen’ as a form of disclaimer for what they have previously discussed, namely the issue of the length of the internship and the possibility of prolonging it. In other words, HO is using the reservation she makes as part of an argument for extending the period of the internship, but in doing so she highlights the present uncertainty of whether the internship will be agreed upon at all.

Extract 11: Now We Will Have to See

59 HO: Og Lizzie er
60 and Lizzie is
61 (0.6)
62 HO: gruppeleder
63 head of division
64 (0.7)
65 HO: i den
66 in the
67 (0.3)
68 HO: gruppe
69 group
70 (0.3)
71 HO: der er tale om du eventuelt skal i praktik
72 there is talk about you potentially will do an internship
73 IN: okay
74 okay
75 (0.3)
76 HO: Ja
77 yes
78 (0.9)
79 HO: ja
80 yes
81 (0.8)
82 HO: Men tak for din ansøgning jeg har (fået/flot) .hh
83 But thank you for your application I have (received/great) .hh
84
85 IN: .mlhh selv [tak]
86 .mlhh you're [welcome]
87 HO: [såå]em
88 [soo]em
89 (0.6)
90 HO: Nu må vi jo- se
91 Now we will have to see
92 (0.6)
93 HO: Ja
94 yes

In this extract the reservation expressed in line 71 by the use of the word ‘potentially’ and in line 91 with the expression ‘now we will have to see’ is not embedded in an argument about a specific matter in the same way, but is rather expressed at the end of an introduction sequence. However, it has the same function here as in the previous extract of setting the scene for the internship interview as a decision making situation and highlighting the uncertainty of whether the internship will be a reality or not. In the previous extract this orientation towards the speech situation was acknowledged by the job consultant, but here the internship candidate is the one who co-constructs the common goal of the interaction with HO.

In some of the other interviews, the employer was not so much establishing the common goal of the speech situation as determining the future possibility of the internship. Rather they were orienting to the goal of arranging and describing the terms and tasks that the internship would involve. In such cases, the future internship is established as a given. This is illustrated by the following three extracts:

Extract 12: You Will Begin Here the Fourteenth November, Right?

13
14 IN: I ellevte november jeg har seksogtyvende
15 In eleventh november I have twentysixth
16 (1.0)
17 HO: .hh nå okay.
18 .hh oh okay.
19 (0.8)
20 HO: ja så lader jeg seksogtyve stå for du skal [star]te her den
21 yes then I leave twentysix because you will [beg]in here the
22
23 IN: [ja]
24 [yes]
25 HO: fjortende november ik
26 fourteenth november right
27
28 IN: ja (.) rigtigt
29 yes (.) right
30 (0.2)
31 HO: og så skal du være ha:r en lille måneds tid til omkring den
32 tiende december
33
34 and then you shall be he:re a little months time til around the
35 tenth of december
36 (0.3)
37 IN: *ja*
38 *yes*
39
40 HO: ja
41 yes

In this example the speech situation is defined and established as a planning meeting rather than a decision-making process. Just two minutes into the interaction, HO refers to what has apparently been previously agreed, namely that IN is to begin the internship at the residential home on the fourteenth of November. The entire beginning of the interaction leading up to the extract has been very informal with no welcome or introduction sequence as in many other of the interviews (see extract 1 and 2 in section 2.2.1).

The participants have very briefly talked about how IN has never before been at a residential home. Moreover, HO has asked IN about where she is from and how old she is in ways that indicate that she is checking or repeating information that she has received in writing beforehand. Thus, the extract is part of an introductory sequence of the interview in which the facts are established and gotten out of the way.

IN responds to and confirms HO's action as checking or establishing facts in line 28, when she not only says 'yes' but 'yes (.) right', which indicates that this is not a matter of dispute but rather something which has already been agreed on. In her next utterance HO continues the activity of checking what has been agreed on by requesting confirmation from IN about the time frame of the internship, which again is responded to and confirmed by IN. By using low voice, IN may be said to be further orient to the fact that the question is not really to be settled but is rather meant to confirm what HO already knows.

The next example is similar to this one in the way the employer makes the fact that the internship has already been agreed upon explicit. However, in the following extract this occurs

at a later point in the interaction and it is formatted as a comment latched on to a presentation of the work-place rather than an actual subject of inquiry.

Extract 13: And That Is Where You Will Be

43 EM: ja det er mig der (0.8) står for køkken og madlavning og
44 frivillige og ja den mobile cafe som sådan og alt det der
45 foregår der
46
47 yes it is me who (0.8) is in charge of kitchen and cooking and
48 volunteers and yes the mobile cafe as such and all that
49 goes on there
50 (0.5)
51
52 EM: og det er jo så der hvor (0.4) du skal være
53 and that is then where (0.4) you will be
54
55 IN: ja hehe
56 yes hehe
57
58 EM: være med
59 be with
60
61 IN: det håber jeg [he he he .hh
62 I hope so [he he he .hh
63

Another important difference between this example and the previous one is the way IN does not display shared knowledge of the internship as something which is agreed on, but rather displays a continued orientation towards the internship interview as a decision-making process. She does not, as IN does in the previous extract, confirm the statement by HO, but rather, by expressing uncertainty and hope, throws this statement into question. This difference in response can be said to be related to the difference in the conversational context and the activity taking place as HO's statement is uttered. As mentioned in the previous example, HO was checking and requesting confirmation of previously received information and IN was acknowledging and contributing to this activity. But in this example HO is in the middle of a presentation of the work-place, when he suddenly makes the declaration which suggests the future reality of the internship. This latched on formatting of the statement seems to take IN off guard, which explains the more reluctant reply and the laughter following it.

The following and final example shows a similar form of latched on orientation towards the internship as something already agreed and thereby towards the internship interview as a planning situation. It occurs within a similar conversational context, namely a presentation of the work-place. In this example the employer does not explicitly declare the internship as a future reality, but links a more implicit orientation towards the internship as a planned future event to a description of the tasks that the internship candidate will be taking part in.

Extract 14: That Could Also Be Something You Could Be Part Of

13 HO: og det gør de to gange om ugen og det har jeg også sagt til
14 Leif at det (var) også noget du ku være med til å skrive
15 og det bliver sammen med cæsar det er ham der laver målingerne
16
17 and they do that two times a week and this I have also told
18 Leif that that (was) also something you could be part of to write
19 and that will be with cæsar he is the one doing the measurements
20 (0.8)
21 HO: og han forklarer dig så og det bliver så på engelsk
22 and he explains to you then and that will then be in english
23 (0.9)
24 HO: hvad du skal skrive hvor du skal skrive det og sådan
25 nogle ting
26
27 what you must write where you must write it and things
28 like that
29

In this example, which takes place at an orchard, HO is in the middle of a description of the work-place. This is, however, done in a less general manner than in the previous example, as the description different types of work, that the workers at the orchard do, is relatively detailed. She has just finished describing the measuring of sugar level in apples and in line 13 refers, almost en passant to a previous conversation she has had with the job consultant about having IN take part in this practice. At first she describes this as only a potential scenario by using the conjunctive form ‘could’ in line 18, but eventually she turns it into something increasingly certain and planned by saying ‘and that will be with Cæsar’ in line 19, ‘and he explains to you then’ and ‘and that will then be in English’ in line 22. These utterances change the orientation towards the internship from a potential to an actual and immediate future event and work to make the internship seem more concrete. This removes some of the uncertainty, which can be said to remain in the previous extract despite HO’s declaration and to be manifested in IN’s response.

While these three examples have individual differences and similarities, they are distinctly different from the previous and the following extracts in that they express an orientation towards the internship as something which is more or less agreed upon and planned to take place. In these extracts there is no orientation towards the internship interview as a decision making process; rather it is oriented to as planning situation and the internship agreement is constructed and talked about as an already established premise of the interaction rather than an object of the interaction.

Thus far I have shown how some of the introductory internship interviews are constructed and oriented to as speech situations in which the common goal is decision making. Others are, as shown, established as speech situations in which the common goal is the

planning of the future internship, which has is referred to as a given premise. If these two types of interviews were placed on opposite poles of a continuum, the remaining introductory interviews in my corpus could be placed in the middle.

As I will show in the remainder of this section, these interviews are characterised by the participants being more ambiguous in their orientations towards the speech situation, their establishment of the goal of the interaction and the status of the internship. Furthermore, they are also distinct in that the needs, motivations, interests and competences of the internship candidate are addressed and constructed as a central factor in determining the future possibility of an internship.

The future reality of the internship is thus constructed as something that depends on the internship candidate, whereas in the previous examples this responsibility is to a larger extent claimed by the employer. In some of these interviews, the internship is more or less laid out as an offer to the internship candidate, who is then, to a larger extent than in the other introductory internship interviews, given a more privileged right to define the terms and content of the internship. The first two of the following extracts are good examples of this.

In the other interviews, the future internship is not so much presented as an offer but rather a potential possibility, which depends on the interests and needs of the internship candidates as well as on their work history and skills. The following extract is an example of the first kind in which the future internship is very much constructed as an offer:

Extract 15: What Should We Agree?

12		
13	HO:	Men Serena du vil gerne komme her og være i praktik.
14		But Serena you would like to come her and be in internship
15	(1.5)	
16	IN:	°ja°
17		°yes°
18	(0.2)	
19	HO:	ja
20		yes
21	(0.7)	
22	HO:	.hh så.
23		.hh so.
24	(0.7)	
25	HO:	Hvad skal vi aftale
26		what should we agree
27	(1.9)	
28	HO:	Hvornår vil du starte
29		when do you want to start
30	(0.7)	
31	HO:	Hvor mange timer skal du være her?
32		How many hours shall you be here?
33	(0.7)	
34	HO:	og hvor længe.
35		and how long.
36	(0.4)	
37	HO:	Hvor lang tid
38		how long time

As we can see from this extract, HO establishes the speech situation as one in which the interests and needs of the internship candidate are to be determined and to form the basis of the internship agreement. The internship candidate is addressed directly and hereby selected as next relevant speaker and there is no interruption or contribution by the job consultant. This distribution of rights to speak is accentuated by the long pauses following HO's questions in line 15, 27, 30, 33, and 36, where IN is given a lot of room to respond and is continually given new concrete questions in response to her lack of uptake. In other words, HO repeatedly prompts IN to actively participate in the internship interview. HO is orienting to the internship as something that is already agreed or accepted and is establishing the planning of the practicalities as the central activity of the interview.

Previous to the extract, which occurs relatively early in the interaction, the employer has welcomed the participants and presented the kindergarten. The employer has emphasised the fact that it is a kindergarten for Muslim children and outlined the implications of this with regards to food and clothing regulations. This has led IN to briefly describe her Muslim background and her experience with these regulations.

The first utterance in the extract can be said to represent a shift to a more concrete discussion of the internship and the organisation of the hours around the needs and the situation of IN. Since IN suffers from arthritis, she is only able to work twenty hours a week, and the participants discuss how they can fit this into the daily schedule of the kindergarten. Thus, the extract represents the initiation of a longer sequence of interaction with the employer and the internship candidate as the primary participants and the goal of the speech situation is the arrangement of the internship and the accommodation of the internship candidates needs. This is also the case in the internship interview from which the following extract is taken:

Extract 16: And Then You Would Like To Be Here Maybe?

114	HO:	og så ku du godt tænke dig at være her måske
115		And then you would like to be here maybe
116		
117		(.)
118	IN:	Jae
119		yeah
120		
121	HO:	I nogle uger
122		for a couple of weeks
123		(0.5)
124		
125	HO:	ja
126		yes
127		
128	IN:	Jae
129		yes

Again HO addresses IN directly with a request for confirmation of her interest in doing an internship, which is oriented to as something that has already been talked about and is now to be planned. As in the previous example, the confirmative response by IN immediately leads to a planning sequence, here focused on the duration of the internship and this continues for a couple of turns after the extract.

The extract initiates a long sequence of interaction in which the internship candidate is given (and takes) the opportunity to describe her thoughts and ideas about the internship after which the employer offers his suggestions as to the concrete content and plan of the internship. Both extracts exemplify orientations towards the speech situation that establish the internship candidate as a central figure in achieving the goal of the interaction, namely the planning and organisation of the internship. Similarly, the internship candidate is addressed and included as a central participant in the next extract. However, unlike the other two examples, the initial address of IN does not in the same way lead to a planning focused on IN's interests and needs. Instead the interaction quickly turns into something that looks very much like a job-interview. This is partially due to another utterance by IN, and partially to the contribution of the job consultant.

Extract 17: Start up Cleaning

13
14 HO: Ja .h (0.2) okay Zabia du kunne godt tænke dig at starte op på det
15 vi sådan snakkede om den dag,
16
17 yes .h (0.2) okay Zabia you would like to start up with what
18 we like talked about that day,
19 (.)
20 IN: *ja*
21 *yes*
22
23 HO: hvor du var inde hvor jeg sagde d- at det vi
24 where you were in where i said w- that what we
25 (0.6)
26 HO: vi har her hos os det er at man gør rent
27 we have here with us that is that one cleans
28 (0.8)
29 HO: i forskellige hjem.
30 in different homes.
31 (0.3)
32 (IN:) *.hja*
33 *.hyes*
34
35 (.)
36 HO: Ik'
37 right
38 (2.9)
39 CO: Og der har du jo nogle erfaringer.
40 and there you have some experience.
41 (0.3)
42 CO: tidligere fra
43 from earlier
44
45 HO: JA [men det ø:hm: eh- Zabia du har aldrig prøvet at være ude
46 YES[but that e:hm: eh- Zabia you have never tried to be out
47
48 (IN): [()]
49 (0.9) (sound of paper being moved)
50 HO: hos kunder
51 with clients

The extract begins in roughly the same way as the two previous ones with a request for confirmation by HO of IN's interests in working as an intern. Similarly, IN also responds to this in line 20, although the 'yes' is uttered in low voice here. But in the other two examples the third turn was used by HO to move directly into the planning of the internship with another question or request for confirmation, this turn is here used to refer back to what the employer has previously told IN about the work-place and the sort of work done there. This elicits another affirmative response from IN in line 32, also in low voice, which is apparently not considered sufficient by HO. This is indicated by the wording 'right' in line 36, which seems to be requesting a further response from IN. After a 2.9 second pause which does not elicit a response from IN, CO takes the floor in line 39 and brings attention to the previous experience that IN has with the type of work described by HO.

In other words, she interprets HO's description of the work-place and the type of work done here. She then requests for confirmation in line 14 and 36 as an invitation for IN to describe her interest in, and previous experience with, cleaning, and since IN does not provide this, CO provides it on her behalf. This extract is another example of the job consultant's role and right to speak on IN's behalf. Here it has the consequence of initiating a discussion of IN's previous experience rather than a planning of the future content of the internship, since HO is now given the option of responding to CO's statement about IN's experience rather than to IN's previous confirmation of interest. HO thus disputes CO's claim about IN's experience on the grounds that she has no experience with cleaning in people's homes, and this leads to a longer exchange about IN's actual experience, which mostly involves cleaning at hospitals and residential homes. Quite a few turns later, HO finally formulates her concern, which is the question of whether IN is able to use a map when driving from address to address.

This extract shows a slightly different orientation towards the speech situation than in the previous two examples, although the first utterance by HO seems to similarly project a confirmation by IN which could lead to a planning of the internship. Due to the third turn follow-up by HO and CO's contribution, the internship interview is established as a site of discussion about the type of work and tasks that the internship implies, and the extent to which IN is able to meet these demands. The initial indication that the internship is a future reality that depends on the internship candidate turns out to be an offer with certain reservations that are to be cleared and discussed first. The actual planning of the internship and thereby the point in which the future of the internship becomes a definite reality is thus postponed for longer

than in the previous two interviews. What is particular about this type of internship interview found in my corpus is the lack of an immediate establishment of the purpose of the interaction as either ‘decision-making’ and ‘assessment’ or ‘planning the details’ of an already agreed internship.

The following extract is similar in the way that the acceptance and planning of the internship interview, which is projected by the first utterance of the employer, is postponed, when the employer initiates a different activity in the third turn following the confirmation of interest by the internship candidate. In this extract, the activity is not a description of the workplace and the tasks it implies as in the previous example, but a further inquiry into the motivations of the candidate with regards to the internship.

Extract 18: Why Would You Like That?

14	HO:	øhm (.) du har snakket øh med din praktikvejleder
15		ehm (.) you have talked eh with your internshipcounsellor
16		
17	IN:	ja
18		yes
19	(.)	
20	HO:	ja?
21		yes?
22	(0.3)	
23	HO:	omkring at øh eventuelt ville ud i pleje her?
24		about eh maybe wanting to come out in care here?
25	(0.2)	
26	IN:	ja
27		yes
28		
29	HO:	Hvorfor kunne du tænke dig det?
30		why would you like that?
31	(0.3)	
32	IN:	.hh fordi: jeg vil gerne eh blive i social sundhedhjælper
33		.hh because: I would like eh to be in care taker
34	(.)	
35	HO:	ja?
36		yes?
37		
38	IN:	ja
39		yes
40	(0.6)	
41	HO:	så din drøm er simpelthen om at tage en ud[dann]else
42		so your dream is basically to take an edu[cation]
43		
44	IN:	[j:a]
45		[ye:s]
46	(.)	
47	HO:	jamen det lyder da dej[ligt]
48		well that sounds wonder[full]

HO uses the third turn in line 29 to request more information about IN’s reasons for wanting to do an internship at the residential home, which IN provides in line 32. Although HO responds to this by displaying understanding in line 41 and giving a positive assessment of IN’s reasons in line 47, the definite indication that the internship has been agreed is not provided immediately. Following the extract, the employer asks two more questions, first about where

IN is from and second whether she has worked with elderly people before, and it is not till after these questions have been asked that she initiates the move into the planning of the internship.

The four extracts presented above all illustrate how some of the introductory internship interviews are oriented to, and established as, speech situations, where the overall goal of the interaction is agreeing on and planning a future internship, and where the central figure in this agreement and planning is the internship candidate. In all of the examples the internship candidate is thus addressed and included in the decision making process by the employer making an opening statement requesting a confirmation from the internship candidate of his/her interest in the internship.

As we have seen, this does not necessarily imply that the internship candidate is hereby granted the right to decide and accept the internship. While in the first two examples the internship candidates' positive responses to the employers request for confirmation made the employer move right into the planning of the internship, the last two examples illustrated that the employer had the possibility and the power to take the interaction in a different direction and postpone any certain indication that the internship was decided and a future reality.

The examples also demonstrated the employers' power to control and define the situation even though their address and inclusion of the internship candidates invited the participation of both them and the job consultants and hereby made the interview more dialogic. And while the examples showed an orientation by the employer towards the goal of the situation as establishing the needs and interests of the internship candidate, they also showed that this goal was not the sole determinant for the actions of the employer or the situation as such. Rather, the situation was in some cases equally defined by the goal of establishing the internship candidate's ability to perform the required tasks and the goal of planning the practicalities of the internship.

While this last group of interviews was markedly more inclusive and oriented towards the needs and interests of the internship candidate, they were in no way less ambiguous than any of the other introductory internship interviews. In these four interviews, as in all the others, the ambiguity of the speech situation does not disappear until the employer actually initiates the planning of the internship or describes the tasks and work that the internship candidate will be involved in. And even at that point, the overall goals of assessment and decision-making potentially influence and inform the participants' actions and interpretations.

As shown with the examples above, the introductory internship interview is in many cases oriented to as, if not a decision-making speech situation, then at least a situation in which the future internship is an unsettled matter that has to be arranged, agreed on and discussed. Out of the nine introductory internship interviews there are only two in which the employers at an early stage in the interviews explicitly express that they consider the internship as an agreement and a future reality. In the other interviews, the decision of accepting the internship candidate is delayed for a shorter or longer time, and the ambiguity of whether the employer has already decided is at times almost tangibly hanging in the air.

This can be said to influence the interaction on a general level in the sense that it creates an air of uncertainty and ambiguity that makes the situation more delicate and insecure for the internship candidate. On a more concrete level it can be said to possibly influence the interactional dynamics by causing the candidate to be more cautious and withheld in their contributions and participation. In any case, the lack of explicitness and the ambiguity of whether the goal of the interaction is assessment and decision making turns many of the introductory internship interviews into speech situations that resemble the gate-keeping interactions described by among others Erickson & Schultz, Celia Roberts and John Gumperz. This dimension of the introductory internship interview will be elaborated in section 2.3.

The Follow-up Internship Interviews

There are some central differences between the introductory and the follow-up internship interview with respect to how it is established and oriented to as a speech situation. First of all, in the follow-up internship interview the participants establish the goal of the speech situation as being the evaluation of the internship as such and the performance of the internship candidate during the first part of the internship. Secondly, the responsibility and right to define the goal of the interaction is given to and claimed by the job consultant, whereas the employer established him/herself as the one in control to a much larger extent in the introductory internship interview.

In all except one of the seven follow-up internship interviews that were recorded, the interactions were initiated either by the job consultant asking the intern about his/her experience so far, or by the employee eliciting an initiation from the job consultant by renouncing the floor and selecting the job consultant as next speaker. The following extract is an example of the former. It should be noted that the participation framework of the follow-up

internship interview is also slightly different, since the employer is not present (except in one instance), as in the introductory internship interview, but only the employee who has worked most closely with the intern during the first period of the internship.

Extract 19: How It Had Been

```

11 CO:      Så nu ville jeg bare høre hvordan
12          so now I just wanted to hear how
13 (0.6)
14 CO:      øøh
15          eeh
16 (0.3)
17 ( )
18 CO:      [he he he]
19          (somebody enters the room, says goodbye and leaves)
20 CO:      hvordan det var gået siden sidst
21          how it had been since last
22 (1.5)
23 CO:      jeg ved ikke om: om du vil starte Nayab hvordan synes du det har
24          været den den sidste u:ge eller halvanden uge
25
26          I don't know if: if you will begin Nayab how you think it has
27          been the the last we:k or week and a half
28 (1.1)
29 IN:      det til mig det meget "godt"
30          it for me it very "good"
31
32 CO:      mm
33 (3.9)
34 CO:      kan du fortælle sådan lidt hva- hvad du har lavet
35          hvilke aktiviteter
36
37          can you tell like a little wha- what you have done
38          what activities

```

This first extract shows the typical way in which the follow-up internship interview is established as an evaluative speech situation in which the job consultant controls the structure and content of the interaction and distributes the rights to talk. It also shows a recurrent tendency for the job consultant to guide the contribution of the intern in the direction of a concrete description of the tasks s/he has undertaken and the specific content of the internship. In line 11-20 CO makes a general and very implicit inquiry about how the internship has been since the last time they met. This is followed by a noticeable absent uptake, which makes CO reformulate her question, this time explicitly directing it at the intern. In line 26 CO asks IN in general terms how the internship has been during the last week and a half and after another long pause, she gets a positive but very general response from IN in the following turn. In line 32 CO responds to this reply minimally encouraging IN to elaborate, but since this does not happen CO asks IN in line 34, after a 3.9 second pause, about the specific activities she has taken part in.

In the following extract it is once again the job consultant who claims the right to define what activities are relevant within the speech situation and hereby establish the purpose of the interaction as being an evaluation of the internship and a description of the activities it has

involved. As it is clear from this extract however, this participant status and speech situation is very much co-constructed and made possible by EM and IN who both orient to CO as the one who knows what is going on and is responsible of orchestrating the development of the interaction.

Extract 20: What Kind Of Assignments Have You Done Here?

```

32 (0.7)
33 EM: nu ved jeg ikke spørg jeg har ikke [vær]et med til
34 now I don't know ask I have not [bee]n in
35
36 CO: [ja]
37 [yes]
38
39 EM: sådan en samtale her [før] som sådan [vel]
40 such a conversatio here [before as such [right]
41
42 CO: [nej] [men det kun vi
43 [no] [but it only we
44
45 skal bare det er sådan [meget meget sådan bare overordnet og [vi
46 should just it is like [very very like just overall and [we
47
48 EM: [ja] [ja]
49 [yes] [yes]
50 CO: snakker bare]
51 just talk]
52
53 EM: hvordan det går]
54 how it is going]
55
56 EM: ja
57 yes
58
59 CO: hvordan det er gået og hvad yasmin du har lavet og .h hvordan du
60 synes det har været å hv- hvordan i synes [yas]min har arbejdet
61
62 how it has been and what yasmin you have done and .h how you
63 think it has been and h- how you think [yas]min has worked
64
65 EM: [ja]
66 [yes]
67
68 CO: kun bare simpelthen .hh så jeg vil måske bare lige spørge dig
69 yasmin hvad er det for nogle opgaver du har lavet her
70
71 only just simply .hh so I will maybe just ask you
72 yasmin what kind of assignments you have done here
73 (0.3)
74 IN: nå okay ja
75 oh okay yeah

```

In the beginning of this extract, in line 33 to 39, EM renounces the participant status of interviewer and selects CO as next speaker by in line 33 requesting CO to ask questions. By saying ‘I have not been in this kind of interaction before’, EM categorises herself as the newcomer and orients to CO as the one familiar with this type of interaction. This serves simultaneously as an invitation to CO to perform the next relevant action and thereby project the future development of the interaction. CO responds to EM’s request in line 36 and acknowledges her claim of unfamiliarity in line 42, where she supplies the requested definition of the purpose and goal of the interaction.

After a confirming response from EM in line 56, CO elaborates the point of the interaction but now orienting to IN as the next relevant speaker by using her name and the second person pronoun ‘You’. In line 42 CO uses the adverb ‘just’, which works to downgrade

the seriousness of the activity at hand or turn it into a casual matter. Repeating the expression in line 68 signals that she is finishing her explanation of what is expected to happen. In line 72 she explicitly gives the floor to IN requesting a description of the activities she has been involved in.

At this point then, the common goal of the interaction and the roles of the participants in fulfilling it have been established with CO as the one asking questions and IN as the primary person answering them. Hence, the follow-up interview is constructed as a speech situation, where the perspective and participation of the intern is central. In this case, the speech situation does, however, seem somewhat construed and problematic. The job consultant is setting up an evaluative discussion between the employee and the intern, but both seem reluctant to participate, and the job consultant works hard to define the purpose of the interaction and to minimize his or her own involvement and contribution.

Central to this impression is the meta-linguistic formulation of the job consultant explaining what the different parties are to contribute with that in some ways resembles the behaviour of a counsellor in a couples therapy session or that of an adult mediating between two children who have been in a fight: “Now you tell George you are sorry you hit him, and you tell Hannah you are sorry you took her shovel”. Even though there is no obvious object of controversy there is the potential voicing of concerns and problems with the internship so far that may explain the parties’ reluctance to participate. In any case, there is a very explicit orchestrating of the development taking place by the job consultant that gives the follow-up interviews a particular mediating character.

This is also apparent in the following extract, but here the role of the mediator is first tentatively claimed by the job consultant and then co-constructed through the participation of the intern and the lack of participation from the employee. In this extract we the job consultant is guiding the behaviour and answers of the intern, steering them in the direction of very concrete descriptions of the various tasks and activities that the intern has been involved in. Here the job consultant further instructs the intern to describe these activities in chronological order throughout a typical workday.

Extract 21: What Kind Of Things?

47 CO: s: skal jeg sådan spørge lidt til
 48 s: shall I like ask a little about
 49 (0.5)
 50 IN: ja
 51 yes
 52
 53 CO: til hvad du har lavet her hva- hvad har du har du sådan arbejdet
 54 med Rania
 55
 56 about what you have done here wha- what have you like worked
 57 with Rania
 58 (0.1)
 59 IN: ja
 60 yes
 61 (1.3)
 62 IN: jeg har [været]
 63 I have [been]
 64 CO: [Rania er det okay hvis du tager hånden (0.4) af munden
 65 sådan (så kan vi)
 66
 67 [Rania is it okay if you take the hand (0.4) out of the
 68 like (so we can)
 69 (1.0)
 70 IN: je:g jeg laver hm. mange forskellige ting
 71 I: I do hm. many different things
 72 (1.8)
 73 CO: og hvad er det for nogen slags ting hvis du tænker på hva- hvordan er
 74 det du starter om mo:rgenen og så
 75
 76 and what kind of things is it if you think of wha- how is
 77 it you begin in the mo:rning and then
 78
 79 (0.5)
 80 CO: så hvis du fortæller et- e: sådan hva- hvad du gør
 81 so if you tell et- e: like wha- what you do
 82 (0.3)
 83 CO: sådan fra morgen til til du går hjem
 84 like from morning till till you go home
 85 (0.9)
 86 IN: nå:
 87 oh:
 88 (1.4)
 89 CO: og jeg skal nok
 90 and I shall
 91 (0.5)
 92 CO: spørge dig lidt ind hvis det er
 93 ask you a little if in case
 94 (0.5)
 95 IN: ja .hhh første gang har været med Sara,
 96 yes .hhh first time I have been with Sara,
 97 (0.3)
 98 IN: .hh så viser hun hvordan man laver alt
 99 .hh then she shows how to do everything
 100 (0.6)
 101 IN: .hh altså
 102 .hh that is
 103 (0.9)
 104 IN: hvordan man lave:r
 105 how one doe:s
 106 (0.5)
 107 IN: de: de gamle mennesker
 108 the: the old people
 109

In line 47 CO begins by defining her participant status as the one in charge of the speech situation and inviting a confirmation of this status. This again shows the co-constructedness of the participation framework and the speech situation, but also illustrates the aforementioned awkwardness related to the ‘staging’ of the situation. In this extract CO both orients to her role as the one orchestrating the development of the interaction and displays a supportive affiliation with the intern. This is clear in line 73, where CO, following a long pause, prompts a further elaboration of IN’s previous description of her daily routines. This becomes even clearer in

line 89, where CO, again following a long pause, establishes her advocating position in relation to the action CO has encouraged in line 73 and 80. The fact that CO makes her role as advocate for IN relevant at this particular moment may be related to the noticeable delay in uptake in line 86 and to the fact that IN's response is minimal. In line 80, CO has requested IN to describe what she does during a day, but this request is formatted as a conjunctive construction 'if you tell...'. This makes the request slightly implicit and the 0.9 seconds pause and the minimal uptake may be viewed as a response to a possible ambiguity caused by this implicitness. The following 1.4 second pause is from this perspective a display of uncertainty from IN about what is expected of her. CO's turn in line 89 displays a recognition of this uncertainty and constitutes an offer to help, which orients to her role as IN's advocate.

As this extract and the previous show, the follow-up internship interview is constructed as an evaluation in which the interns are expected to recount both their general feeling about the internship and the actual activities that they have taken part in. The job consultant is expected to be the one orchestrating the situation and supporting the contribution of the intern. This does not mean, however, that the employee is completely passive and does not have a role to play in the interaction. Often they are involved in the interaction at a later stage and contribute by giving their perspective on the internship and the performance of the intern. The employees are, in other words, oriented to and established as central figures in the evaluation of the internship. While the interns are often expected to provide descriptions of the activities they have taken part in, the employees are orienting to and being oriented to as the ones responsible for bringing up any problems that have arisen during the internship.

The following extract is an example of the employer orienting towards the speech situation as an evaluation in which any problems or concerns that the intern may have had can be raised. This example is not representative of the way in which problems would normally be addressed. Usually the job consultant would encourage the employee to describe their impression of the intern and the internship, but in this instance the employee encourages the intern to describe how she feels.

The example shows how the employees orient to their responsibility of addressing the problematic aspects of the internship, and how they, at times, claim shared responsibility for orchestrating and controlling the speech situation. This is however the only one of the recorded follow-up internship interview in which the employer initiates the interaction and orients to his

participant status as being the one who asks the questions and controls the development and purpose of the situation.

Extract 22: How You Think You Feel?

10
11 EM: Det jeg egentlig godt ville spørge dig om dels det er hvordan (0.2)
12 du synes du har det
13
14 what I would really like to ask you about that is how (0.2)
15 you think you feel
16
17 EM: og du: er velkommen til at tale frit fra leveren .h jeg har jo
18 tavshedspligt .hh
19
20 and you: are welcome to speak freely .h I have you know
21 professional secrecy
22
23 IN: [mm. he he he he .hh he he .hh]
24
25 EM: [så: så det er jo nåmen det har jeg]
26 [so: so that is you know well I do]
27
28 IN: ja: jeg har det godt
29 yes: I feel good
30
31 EM: ja
32 yes
33 (0.3)
34 IN: altså de:t det e:r jeg synes det er dejligt at være her
35 that is i:t it i:s I think it is wonderfull to be here
36 (0.5)
37 IN: fordi allesammen er søde og rare o:g
38 because everyone is nice and kind a:nd
39 (0.5)
40 IN: jeg lærte meget faktisk i:
41 I learned a lot actually in:
42 (0.3)
43 IN: I her halvanden uge jeg som jeg her
44 In here one and a half week I that I here
45 (0.7)
46 IN: altså
47 that is
48
49 CO: to en halv uge du har været

EM does not, as in the other extracts from follow-up internship interviews previously shown, wait for the job consultant to initiate and define the speech situation. Instead, he immediately establishes the situation as one in which he is to learn about the experience and potential problems of the intern. Consequently, the employee claims shared responsibility for the speech situation and for the internship and the feelings of the intern. In the other follow-up internships, the role and also the responsibility of the employee with respect to the evaluation are less pronounced.

The following example is more typical of the employee's role in addressing problems related to the internship. Here it is the job consultant who encourages the employee to give their impression of the internship and the intern. The typical role of the employee in the follow-up internship interviews is in the role as evaluator and not as in the previous extract the role of inviting the perspectives and potential critique of the intern.

Extract 23: The Language We Have Not Been Able To Do Much About

43 CO: ja (.) hvordan synes øh
 44 yes (.) how do eh
 45 (1.3)
 46 CO: I det har været de sidste: den sidste halvanden uge
 47 you think it has been the la:st the last week and a half
 48 (1.4)
 49 EM: hyggeligt
 50 nice
 51 (0.4)
 52 EM: [he he hah hah hah]
 53 CO: [mhe he he .hhh]
 54
 55 CO: godt [.hh jhe he det sender jeg videre]
 56 good [.hh jhe he I will pass that on]
 57 EM: [he he HAH HAH HAH .hhh]
 58
 59 EM: heh. he [he]
 60 CO: [he] ja
 61 [he] yes
 62 (0.5)
 63 EM: nej (.) de:t øh
 64 no (.) i:t eh
 65 (0.6)
 66 EM: altså
 67 like
 68 (0.3)
 69 EM: øh- sproget har vi j- (0.3) har vi jo ikke ku gøre så meget
 70 ved
 71 eh- the language we have l- (0.3) we have not been able to do so
 72 mucha bout
 73 (0.4)
 74 EM: øøh
 75 eeh
 76 (0.3)
 77 EM: men (0.6) altså
 78 but (0.6) like

This extract follows a long sequence in which the intern has responded to questions from the employer about her experiences with the internship and the activities she has done. This interaction was different from the other follow-up interviews, since both the employer and an employee were present. When CO then in line 43-46 asks ‘how do you think it has been...’ she is orienting towards the employer and the employee and inviting their perspective on the internship as a follow-up to the perspective previously offered by the intern.

The employee first responds to this invitation in line 49 with the word ‘nice’, which is then treated as insufficient and oriented to as ironic with the following laughter from EM and CO and the comment ‘I will pass that on’ from CO. In line 63 EM then offers an alternative and serious response to CO’s question, in which he establishes the language of IN as a problematic but basic premise that they have not been able to do much about. Hence, EM uses the opportunity offered by IN to describe his experience with the internship to address a problem, namely the problem of language. In line 77 and following the extract he then follows this up with a presentation of how IN has become more open and self-confident.

The extract shows how the employee and the job consultant both contribute to the establishment of the speech situation around the central purpose of evaluating the performance

of the intern during the internship. It furthermore shows that the employee is given, and takes, responsibility in meeting this goal and is oriented to by the job consultant as a central participant in this respect.

The follow-up internship interview is similar to the introductory internship interview in the sense that a central purpose and goal of the speech situation is the assessment of the internship candidate. However, it differs in the way that this assessment is retrospective and based on the summary and description of the tasks and activities that the intern has taken part in. Furthermore, the follow-up internship interview differs in its participation framework in the sense that it is the job consultant who is being oriented to and establishes herself as the one in control of the development, content and purpose of the interaction and thereby the right to define the speech situation. In the introductory internship interview this role was mainly administered by the employer and the employee, whose participation and role in the follow-up internship interview is defined and controlled by the job consultant to a large extent.

The follow-up internship interview may be characterised as a speech situation in which the job consultant includes and invites the perspectives and experiences of the intern and the employer respectively. The job consultant thus invites them to co-construct an evaluation of the internship that forms the basis of a decision of the future plans for the intern. Sometimes the participants decide to extend the internship, often based on the argument that the language and communication skills need to be improved, and sometimes a plan is made for the specific skills that the intern needs to focus on during the remainder of the internship. This makes the follow-up internship interview potentially as important and consequential for the candidate as the introductory internship.

The fact that the employee is often invited to describe their impression of the intern and the internship and that they often bring up any problems with the internship or the intern in response to this shows a mutual orientation towards the goal of the internship as being the improvement of the interns' skills and future chances in the education system or the labour market. The specifics of this orientation will be elaborated in chapter 5 where it will be argued that the formulation and topicalisation of barriers, skills and knowledge are informed by particular understandings of nationality, language and religion and involve processes of categorization and differentiation.

While the introductory internship interview and the follow-up internship interview may be characterised as decision-making and evaluative speech situations respectively, the analysis

above has illustrated the complexity of the way in which the overall goals of the interactions and the roles of the participants are established and oriented to and the way this influences the setting of the interaction. In the case of the introductory internship interview, the different ways in which the overall goal of decision-making was treated and oriented to, turned the interactions into evaluating, planning, or counselling situations. In the case of the follow-up internship interviews the participants' ways of orienting to and striving to meet the overall goal of evaluating the internship interview meant that the interviews sometimes resembled exam situations and at other times seemed more like teacher-student conferences.

In the following section, I will focus on how the overall setting or speech situation may be sub-divided into various speech events that are closely related to the shifting roles and orientations of the participants. While the description of the internship interview as a particular speech situation has provided an overall idea of the purposes and goals of the two types of internship interviews, the following sub-categorisation into speech events describes the way that the orientations and roles of the participants is organised by their knowledge and achievement of various culturally familiar events.

2.2.3 Institutional Speech Events

As previously mentioned, Hymes emphasises that a speech situation is not organized and structured by a general set of rules and restrictions, since all speech situations such as a fishing trip or a dinner party comprise various different speech events such as, in the latter case, having dinner, doing small-talk etc. These events are individually structured and imbued with different rules and restrictions of speech and activities that make the event recognisable and understandable to the participants and that together form the overall situation. Dividing the speech situation into different speech events is useful when characterizing the internship interview because it is a speech situation that consist of and incorporate many different speech events that recognizable and are found in other speech situations. Consequently, it is useful to organize and structure the previously mentioned activities and goals that the internship interview comprises and relate them to culturally familiar events. Hymes defines a speech event in the following way:

The term speech event will be restricted to activities, or aspects of activities, that are directly governed by rules or norms for the use of speech. An event may consist of a single speech act, but will often comprise several...Notice that the same type of speech act may recur in different types of speech event a, and the same type of

speech event in different contexts of situation. Thus, a joke (speech act) may be embedded in a private conversation, a lecture, a formal introduction. A private conversation may occur in the context of a party, a memorial service, a pause in changing sides in a tennis match (Hymes 1974:52).

Although all verbal interaction, from an ethnomethodological or conversation analytical perspective, can be said to be rule-governed at the level of turn-taking and membership categorisation, Hymes is here talking about a type of rules and norms associated with particular clusters of activities, found and recognised as units of actions within different speech situations.

This conceptualisation of particular interactional and verbal events as specifically institutionalised and routinised makes it compatible with some of the literature on institutional interaction written within the disciplines of Conversation Analysis (Drew & Heritage 1992b) and Interactional sociolinguistics (Roberts & Sarangi 1999b). Here one finds similar ideas of verbal interactions being structured and organized by a repeated and institutionalized practice in a way that makes the participants orient to and follow a specific distribution of rights of participation, a particular distribution of knowledge and organisational procedure.

The internship interview generally qualifies as an institutional speech situation, but it is more complex and heterogeneous than other institutional forms of interaction because the participants continually negotiate and redefine the main activities and goals of the interaction as well as the statuses and roles of the participants. The internship interview is therefore hardly definable as one type of institutional interaction but must rather be characterised as hybrid of different and distinguishable types of speech events that are each organized around particular goals and activities and structured by specific participation frameworks.

Some of the work done on various forms of institutional interactions may shed light on some of the different events being oriented to and made relevant by the participants. Roberts and Sarangi, for example, describe how the oral examination interview is a blend of academic examination and selection interview (1999c:483), which are events that can also be identified and found in the internship interview. In this section the characterizations made by conversation analysts and interactional sociolinguists of various forms of institutional interactions will be used as a frame of reference in the identification of the various speech events that the internship interviews comprises.

The internship interview has not, to date, been described analytically or been characterised, as opposed to many other similar forms of communicative events and institutional forms of interactions such as job-interviews (Akinlolu & Seabrook 1982; Adelswärd 1992; Auer 1998; Scheuer 2001; Roberts & Campbell 2006), oral examination exams (Roberts & Sarangi 1999b), student counselling sessions (Erickson & Schultz 1982) and report-card meetings (Mazeland & Berenst 2006). However, the internship interview as a communicative event can, to a large extent, be described in relation to these other communicative events and some of the features that have been described as characteristic of them.

In *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional settings* Drew & Heritage (1992a:21-25) propose some overall distinctive features of institutional interactions in relation to ordinary talk that help to understand the kind of rules and restrictions Hymes talks about regarding speech events.

Firstly, the institutional interaction is characterised by at least one of the interlocutors orienting towards some overall goals or tasks in the interaction. Part of what characterises the internship interview is that the participants are oriented towards many different goals and activities such as planning the internship, evaluating the internship, evaluating the candidate both before and after the internship, making a decision about and agreeing on the internship etc. Other institutional interactions have more clearly defined primary activity and goals, e.g. the job-interview where the main purpose and activity is the assessment of the candidates.

This is not to say that nothing besides assessment is going on within a job-interview, or that the internship interview is the only institutional interaction comprising a complex interplay of activities, goals and agendas. However, in many institutional interactions the participants orient to one activity or goal as primary and other activities such as small-talk sequences, joking, self-presentations, story-telling and so on as secondary or supplementary to the main task at hand. In the internship interview the primary activity and purpose is continually negotiated and changes interview by interview, moment by moment and practically turn by turn, and the participants even seem to orient to the ongoing activity very differently at times.

The second defining characteristic of institutional interactions is, according to Drew and Heritage, the constraints that are imposed on the interlocutors in relation to the tasks or goals of the interaction. These may manifest themselves in certain conversational actions taking place, but also in certain actions or topics being carefully avoided. Furthermore the participants' mutual expectations of the institutionality of the interaction can influence the

inferences, reasonings and implicatures of the interaction and make actions seem deviant in relation to the expectations. Actions that would normally be characterised as disaffiliative if they were to appear in ordinary conversation can be perfectly expected and unmarked in institutional interactions, such as long pauses or the absence of displays of empathy, enthusiasm, encouragement etc.

While the internship interview can be characterised as institutional according to these overall features described by Drew and Heritage, this does not in itself account for or describe the various forms of institutionality that the internship interviews, individually and as a whole, encompass. One can say that the general category 'institutional interaction' does not express the way that institutionality is realized differently according to the specific speech situations and speech events that the participants orient to and establish

The institutionality of an interaction is closely related to the organisation of the participation framework and the distribution of roles and rights to speak and act in specific ways and at specific times. Drew & Heritage (1992a:4) emphasise that it is not the physical setting as such that determines the institutionality of an interaction, but rather the fact that certain professional or institutional identities are made relevant in the interaction by its interlocutor .

Making such institutional identities relevant, various tasks and actions are also made relevant, which manifests itself in the character and outcome of the interaction in specific ways (Drew & Heritage 1992a:4). They describe three ways in which the institutionality of an interaction manifests itself in the interactional organisation, namely: 1) Distribution of participation rights, 2) Distribution of knowledge and rights to knowledge and, 3) Different access to organisational routines and procedures (1992a:49-53). In the chart below I have summarized the ways in which the participants orient to and establish this organisation and I will return to this shortly. It should be noted that listing the features of institutional interaction may be misleading in the sense that it seems to suggest a certain setting as definitive of an institutional interaction. However, the description of the features of the institutionality of the internship interview should not be read as a schematic generalization of the internship interview as such but rather as a summary of some institutional features that were analytically derived.

Distribution of Rights	Distribution of Knowledge	Access to organizational procedure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Turn distribution •Topic initiation and closing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Orientation to HO, EM and CO as knowledgeable and IN as learner/mentee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Check-list topic organization •'Case'descriptions •Turn distribution and recipient design

Table 3: Manifestations of institutionality in internship interviews (based on Drew & Heritage 1992b)

Starting with the left column, the distribution of rights in the introductory internship interview is, as shown in section 2.2.1 predominantly established in a way so that the employer is the one to take the first turn, select the next speaker and initiate or close topics. This is exemplified in the following extract.

Extract 24: The Scarf

155
156 HO: [m Nadi jeg] tænkte på >[øh] gø- gø-< vil du fortælle lidt
157 [Nadi I] was thinking >[eh] ge- ge-< would you tell a little
158
159 (IN:) [ja]
160 [yes]
161
162 HO: om dig selv?
163 about yourself?
164 (0.2)
165 HO: Jeg kunne godt tænke mig at høre hvem du [er?] (high pitch)
166 I would like to hear who you [are?]
167
168 IN: [mh.heh] ja:, .hh jeg hedder
169 [mh.heh] yes, .hh my name is
170
171 Nadia jeg kommer fra Somalia=
172 Nadia I come from Somalia=
173
174 HO: =ja=
175 =yes=
176
177 IN: =og jeg bor i Danmark ni år.
178 =and I live in Denmark nine years
179 (0.2)
180 HO: ja
181 yes
182
183 IN: .hhh og jeg har tre børn,
184 .hhh and I have three children,
185
186 HO: Du har tre børn.
187 You have three children.
188
189 IN: ja
190 yes
191
192 HO: ja
193 yes
194
195 (0.4)
196 IN: .hhh og jeg toog- treogtrediv e år
197 .hhh and I thirtytwo- thirtythree years

This extract shows how HO has the capacity to change topics and control the agenda of the interview. Here she does this by first overlapping CO in line 156 and asking IN to tell about herself and then by establishing herself as the ratified recipient of IN's response in line 174 and 180 where she encourages IN to continue. Following the extract HO begins guiding the response of IN more by asking her more specific questions about her previous work-experience and interest in becoming a caretaker for the elderly, and finally overlaps one of IN's responses and asks her about her religious dress. This part of the interaction will be further analyzed in section 5.5 but what is central here is the way HO controls and guides the development of the interaction and how both she and the internship candidate are displaying an orientation towards certain rights and restrictions of participation.

With regards to the distribution of turns the introductory internship interview is very similar to the job-interview, which is described by various theorists as being interviewer controlled and structured by the questioning of candidate by the interviewer (Akinaso & Seabrook 1982; Adelswärd 1988; Scheuer 2001; Roberts & Campbell 2006). In the introductory internship interview, the employer and, to a lesser extent the employee, are the ones to ask the questions and select the next speaker, while the internship candidate, or the job consultant, is the one who answers.

In the follow-up internship interviews, on the other hand, the job consultant takes the role of interviewer and the employee and the intern take the role of interviewee. Although the two types of internship interviews are similar to the job-interview in the sense that they both have a central participant acting in the role of interviewer and controlling the interaction, they are not as neatly and tightly structured as the job-interview described by Scheuer (2001) and Roberts and Campbell (2006). In his study of 41 interviews in Denmark with candidates of Danish ethnic background, Scheuer describes how these job-interviews were “...structured in accordance with standard procedure.” (Scheuer 2001:225) and could be divided into five different phases, namely introduction, general information, asking questions, detailed information and ending. This structure, which is very similar to the structure found in other studies of job-interviews by Adelswärd (1988) and Akinaso & Seabrook (1982), is not found in neither the introductory nor the follow-up internship interviews.

In their study of 61 interviews in Britain Roberts and Campbell (2005; 2006) describe how the interviews were either highly structured *Equal Opportunities Interviews* (2006:70-71), where all questions were written down and read out and no follow-up questions or help was

given by the interviewer, or semi-structured interviews (2006:72) with a range of key questions and a varied range of follow-up questions.

The purpose of having this fixed or relatively fixed structure is to ensure a fair and equal treatment of all the candidates and to establish a common ground on which to base the assessment. This purpose and goal is not in effect in the internship interviews, since these interviews are from the onset part of an employment initiative specifically aimed at a people with a different ethnic background than Danish. Although there are some questions and some topics that are repeated across the internship interviews, they are very different from the equal opportunities interviews that Roberts & Campbell describe, where all questions were written down and read out. Likewise, they also differ from the semi-structured interviews in that they are not organized around the same kind of key questions or as uniformly established as one type of speech situation.

Although the internship interviews contain many of the same elements and phases as described by Roberts, Scheuer and Akinnaso et al. and are generally similar enough to qualify as a specific type of speech situation, they are too individually different in the structuring and organisation of these goals and elements to be neatly divided into phases. Part of the reason for this is that they are planned and orchestrated by different job consultants, who represent different job-counselling projects that each follows their own guidelines.

Another part of the reason is that the internship interview is not, like the job-interview, a well known or recognizable a type of speech situation and is therefore much more ambiguously and differently oriented to and established by the participants. Thirdly, they are not, as the job-interviews described by Akinnaso and Ajirotutu, staged or controlled by the researchers, which in Akinnaso et al.'s study can be said to explain and enable the high degree structure and homogeneity (Akinnaso & Seabrook Ajirotutu 1982:132). Although the activities and purposes of all verbal interactions are established in situ in negotiation between the participants, this establishment is often, in the case of institutional interactions, guided by the mutual expectations of the speech situation by the participants.

In the case of the internship interview and specifically the introductory internship interview, participants orient to the speech situation as if they do not know what to expect, or at least as if their expectations vary. Hence, the introductory internship interview is very much established and negotiated in situ and is, as mentioned, not merely oriented to as an evaluative and decision-making speech situation, but also as an informal planning situation in which the

interests and needs of the internship candidate and the employer are to be established. This implies that in the introductory internship interview the employee and the job consultant also exercise the right to control the interaction and the distribution of turns, though in a lesser degree. And although the intern generally orients to and aligns with the role of interviewee by answering in second turn, ending speech when interrupted, and elaborating answers when probed, there is a higher degree of opportunity for the intern to bring up topics, raise areas of concern and voice specific needs or interests.

When looking at the function and goal of the questions themselves, some of them, like the questions in the job-interview, encourage the candidate to present or introduce themselves. They are not however, as in the job-interview, focused as uniquely on the competences of the candidate in the sense that they do not try to probe or inquire into the exact span and content of these competences. Roberts and Campbell (Roberts & Campbell 2006) describe how, in their study of job-interviews with born abroad candidates, the interviewer would try to elicit a demonstration of specific skills and experience such as team-work, self-organisation, dealing with customers, making improvements as well as descriptions of the candidates motivations and previous work-experience and routines. The interviewer would, apart from asking specific questions, depict a scenario that the candidate then had to relate to by giving a narrative account of how he or she would act in the given situation. This way of asking questions by eliciting a narrative never occurred in the internship interviews, and although the employers or job consultants at times elicited narratives about their work history, the candidates usually answered questions about their competences, experiences and motivations by giving brief accounts that were often in a list format.

With respect to the distribution of knowledge, the participants orient to the employer and the employee as professionally knowledgeable, and the intern as learner or mentee. The employer makes elaborate presentations of the work place, and invites the intern to take part in the daily job-routines and learn from future colleagues. The employer is often included in these claims to knowledge by being asked to elaborate on specific tasks and duties, and the job consultant contributes by making specific suggestions about skills that are relevant for the intern to acquire. The candidate is orienting to her institutional role of learner or mentee by expressing appreciation of the suggestions and offers made, and by displaying interest through asking clarifying questions.

Extract 25: Danish

14	HO:	Men jeg synes i hvert fald [a:t] en eller anden (.) lørdag eller
15		But I think in any case [th:at] some (.) sa:turday or
16		
17	IN:	[mm]
18		
19	HO:	søndag der der synes jeg det kunne være sjovt for dig at komme herud
20		fordi vi har (.) som sagt (0.9) øøh åben for en masse kunder o:g
21		
22		sunday then then I think it could be fun for you to come out here
23		because we have (.) as mentioned (0.9) eeh open to a lot of clients
24		a:nd
25		
26	IN:	Mm
27		
28	HO:	den der hele det der løben omkring
29		that all that comotion around
30		(0.5)
31	IN:	[ja ja]
32		[yes yes]
33		
34	HO:	[at de] handler og køber o:g og og det sådan altså man ser (0.3)
35		[them] negotiating and shopping a:and and and it like you see (0.3)
36		
37		tingene [på en lidt anden måde]
38		things [in sort of a different way]
39		
40	IN:	[j:a: du kan for]tælle [om] du vil jeg *du kommer*
41		[ye:a: you can tell] [if] you want me *you come*
42		
43	HO:	[ja]
44		[yes]
45		
46	HO:	Ik [altså] jeg [je::g] føler nok mere [altså] jeg kan nok ikke
47		Right [like] I [i:::] feel I guess more [like] I can probably not
48	IN:	[()] [()] [()]
49		
50	HO:	lære dig
51		teach you
52		
53	IN:	(nej)
54		(no)
55		
56	HO:	no:get sådan (0.2) generelt øhm
57		so:metthing like (0.2) general ehm
58		
59	IN:	okay
60		okay
61		
62	HO:	f- fagligt
63		P- professionally
64	(0.7)	
65	IN:	ja
66		yes
67		
68	HO:	Det kan jeg nok ik'
69		That I probably can't
70	(0.2)	
71	HO:	Men jeg kan give dig en fornemmelse af (0.6) hvad der sker
72		But I can give you a sense of (0.6) what happens
73	(0.8)	
74	HO:	Hvad det er vi lægger vægt på og hvordan vi gerne vil (0.2) øøh
75		ha' vores produkter
76		
77		what it is we emphasize and how we would like to have (0.2)
78		eeh our products

In this extract HO and IN are both orienting to the fact that the purpose of the internship is for IN to learn something from HO and the workplace. In line 14 HO suggests that IN should come out to the orchard one time during the weekends to see another dimension of the workplace. IN is orienting to this invitation in line 40 making clear that if HO wants him too, he will do that, hereby establishing HO's position as a decision maker. In line 46 HO explains the purpose of the invitation and clarifies that this is the type of learning experience she can offer. IN responds to this by giving various tokens of acknowledgement showing alignment with HO's statement. The extract shows that HO and IN are cooperating in establishing the position

of mentor and mentee, with HO making various claims to knowledge and experience and IN showing cooperation and willingness to learn on HO's terms.

With respect to the particular distribution of knowledge between the participants, the institutionality of the introductory internship interview and the follow-up internship interview are similar to the institutionality of job-interviews as described by Akinnaso et al. (1982) counselling sessions as described by Erickson and Schultz (1982), oral examination exams as described by Roberts and Sarangi (1999c) and report-card meetings as described by Mazeland and Berenst (2006). In these very different contexts, the distribution of knowledge is clearly defined and established by the participants in relation to a teacher-learner, or counsellor-learner relationship, which is also found in the introductory and follow-up internship interviews. The description by Akinnaso et al of the job-interview captures this accurately:

But perhaps the most pervasive structural feature of the job-interview is its fixed organizational structure and the strict allocation of rights and duties. Basically, the interviewer has power over the interviewee. S/he controls both the organizational structure of the interview and the mechanics of the interaction... S/he has the privilege of starting it, of introducing new topics or changing topic lines, and of terminating the conversation (Akinnaso & Seabrook Ajiotutu 1982:121).

Like these speech events, the internship interviews are characterised by a high degree of asymmetry in relation to distribution of knowledge, which is not only manifested in the orientations of the participants within the actual interactions but in the organisation and structure of and around the job-counselling projects. Furthermore, the interviews are, as will be shown in section 5.4, characterised by an uneven distribution of knowledge of the Danish language, a matter which is made relevant in all of the interviews by the participants orienting to it explicitly or implicitly in various ways.

The third way in which the institutionality of the internship interview manifests itself in the actions and orientations of the participants is by the participants' display of having differential access to organisational routines and procedures. Given that a professional has many similar interactions with clients having similar issues, concerns or goals, the interaction may become routinised, and the professional may treat the client as a case. On the other hand, a given institutional interaction may possibly represent the first of its kind to the client and s/he may treat her case as unique and personal. The display of a differential access to organisational routines and procedures is apparent when looking at the actions of the job consultant. The job consultant is responsible for helping many job-candidates and is in most of the interviews

displaying this by initiating topics in a check-list manner and by making 'case' descriptions of the internship procedure and the internship candidate. The following extract from an introductory internship interview is an example of this.

Extract 26: The Way We Work

586 CO: Så. Det er sådan typisk den måde vi arbejder på og så gør vi
 587 det at vi overlader det jo som regel helt til arbejdspladsen og
 588 praktikanten at finde ud af alt
 589
 590 so. That is typically the way we work and then we do this
 591 that we leave it you know usually completely up to the workplace and
 592 the intern to figure out everything
 593 (.)
 594 CO: ligesom det var et job ik .hh
 595 like it was a job right .hh
 596
 597 HO: mm
 598
 599 CO: men vi gør så det- vi er så sådan en slags garanti for praktikanten
 600 og fo:r og i øvrigt også for for f- for kommunen
 601 at det forløber ordentligt at der er noget indhold og at:
 602 det kan bruges til noget at det fører til et eller andet
 603
 604 but we do then that- we are then like a guarantee for the intern
 605 and fo:r and also for for f- for the municipality
 606 that it proceeds properly and that there is some content and that:
 607 it can be used for something that it leads to something
 608
 609 HO: mm
 610
 611 CO: så vi laver typisk en aftale om at vi kommer ud øhh efter
 612 x antal uger og tager en snak om hvordan går det og vi- vi
 613 vi gør gerne det vi laver sådan en:
 614
 615 so we typically make an agreement that we come out eh after
 616 x number of weeks and talk about how is it going and we- we
 617 we normally make this kind of
 618
 619 % sound of paper being moved
 620
 621 CO: (jeg har) sådan et eksempel på en praktikaf[tale] med
 622 (I have) this example of an internship agree[ment] with me
 623
 624 HO: [ja:]
 625 [yes:]

Here CO describes his practice and role as a job consultant and constructs it as reoccurring and routinised by using the word 'typically' in line 590. In line 611- 617 CO describes the practice of doing a follow-up interview and again refers to this as common procedure with the word 'typically', and finally he presents the internship agreement that will formally establish and confirm the internship and, for the third time, describes this as usual procedure by using the formulation 'we usually do this' in line 617. The internship agreement was a reoccurring element that the job consultant brought up in all of the introductory internship interviews, which contributed to a formalization and routinisation of the speech situation and showed an orientation towards the internship candidate as a case and the job consultant as a professional bureaucrat.

The internship candidate's status as 'case' is also realized by the job consultant and the employer designing their turns in ways that exclude the intern as a recipient, which results in long sequences of interaction without the participation of the intern. This is clear from the

previous extract, where the job consultant's descriptions are designed for the reciprocity of the employer and the employee and thus excludes the internship candidate from participating. This is illustrated in the following extract.

Extract 27: We as a Workplace

229 CO: ja nu ved jeg ikke hvor meget mere jeg skal sige men altså det jeg
 230 har med det kan vi også lige tage så det at vi har lavet sådan en
 231 arbejdsplan og det var jo så også det du allerede (.) forgreb altså
 232 ved at man selvfølgelig laver en plan for hvad det ligesom er der
 233 skal ske .hh og hvor det selvfølgelig også er vigtigt for os at
 234 understrege hele tiden at man ligesom bliver afprøvet i forhold
 235 til noget konkret som ligger (0.3) i forhold til det man så er
 236 uddannet som i det her øjeblik- øh børnehaveklasselærer .hh
 237 og så har vi lavet sådan en øh et kompetencevurderingsskema som vi
 238 regner med bliver udfyldt til sidst .hhh og nu snakker du jo så
 239 allerede videre ikke men det k- nogen vil jo også gå ud
 240 efterfølgende og så [det vigtig]t for os ligesom at have noget
 241
 242 yes now I don't know how much more I should say but like what I
 243 brought we might as well go over so that we have made this kind of
 244 workplan and that was what you already (.) anticipated like
 245 that one of course makes a plan for what it kind of is that
 246 should happen .hh and where it is obviously also important for us to
 247 emphasize all the time that one is kind of tested in relation to
 248 something concrete that is (0.3) related to what one is
 249 educated in like in this mom- øh kindergarten teacher .hh
 250 and then we have made this eeh a competenceevaluation form that we
 251 expect filled out in the end .hhh and now you are then
 252 already talking beyond that right but it c- some will also go out
 253 afterwards and then [the im]portant thing for us is to have some
 254 HO: [ja ja]
 255 [yes yes]
 256 CO: dokumentation for hvad har man lavet i perioden
 257 documentation for what has one done in the period
 258
 259 HO: det vil sige vi som arbejdsplads:
 260 that is we as a workplace
 261
 262 CO: skal vurdere Maria=
 263 must evaluate Maria=
 264
 265 HO: =ja
 266 =yes

Here CO only orients to HO as the next relevant speaker by using the pronoun 'you' repeatedly in line 229 to 253 and referring back to something HO has previously said and done. As in the previous example CO describes her function and demands as a job consultant and speaks on behalf of the project she is part of. Again a formal document which must be filled out during the internship is mentioned, and although it is a competence evaluation form rather than an internship agreement this time, the fact that it is mentioned has the same effect of highlighting the interns' status of a 'case'. In line 254 HO confirms herself as the recipient of CO's description, and in the remainder of the extract CO and HO cooperate in establishing their roles and functions in the administration and evaluation of the internship and the assessment of the internship candidate. In other words, this extract is an example of how the institutionality of the internship interview is to a large extent related to the way in which the internship candidates are constructed and oriented to as 'cases', and how this is partially achieved by excluding them from participation.

The internship can, as shown above, be described as a speech situation comprised by a range of different speech events that are institutional in ways that structure the expectations, activities, goals and the participation framework of the interaction. This is not to say that the internship interview can be described as the sum of its parts and that the activities and goals of the participants can be reduced to the effectuation of a range of rules and expectations determined by a specific event being staged. On the contrary, it is, as previously stated, the actions and activities of the participants that continually establish and negotiate the ongoing events and the situation as a whole. These actions and activities are only informed and influenced by the participants' orientations towards the situation and the other participants to a certain extent.

Actions, then, cannot be assumed or predicted on the grounds of pre-established ideas about the situation or the participants involved in it; rather, they should be described and explained with reference to other actions and orientations within the interaction. Put differently, the participants in the internship interview use their knowledge, however unequally distributed, about the actions, orientations and membership categories of the other participants, as well as the speech situation as such, to interpret and perform actions and activities.

Although the participants establish the internship interaction as institutional through their orientations to specific regularities and a certain distribution of rights and knowledge, it is however not only the membership categories of employer, internship candidate, job consultant and employee and interviewers, interviewees and administrator that are made relevant. As stated in the beginning of the section, participants in interaction have access to a range of cultural, linguistic and social membership knowledge that can be used as a resource to interpret not only the speech situation but also the social identities, roles and statuses of the other participants. Gumperz describes the process in which statuses and roles are established in the following way:

Communication is not governed by fixed social rules; it is a two-step process in which the speaker first takes in stimuli from the outside environment, evaluating and selecting from among them in the light of his own cultural background, personal history, and what he knows about his interlocutors. He then decides on the norms that apply to the situation at hand. These norms determine the speaker's selection from among the communicative options available for encoding his intent. (Gumperz 1972:15)

This means that the participation framework and the speech situation are not only shaped by the institutionality of the interaction. They are also shaped by the participants' actions, utterances and responses in an interaction that are, again, informed by the cultural, linguistic and social resources and knowledge available to them within the context. In chapter 5 I will describe how the orientation towards membership categories related to nationality, language and religion reveal the manifestation of such knowledge and resources, but this goes beyond an initial characterization of the structure and organisation of the internship interview.

What is central in this respect is how the participation framework is simultaneously established by and establishing the speech situation and the various constitutive speech events, and how this is all manifested in the distribution of turns, knowledge and access to organisational routines and procedures. As shown, this distribution is asymmetric in such a way that endows the internship candidate or the intern with the fewest rights to distribute turns, the least knowledge and the least access to organisational procedures. In the introductory and the follow-up internship interview respectively, the employer and the job consultant are the ones in control of the interactional development, and the ones with most knowledge and most access to the procedures in and around the internship interview. Furthermore the employer, the employee and the job consultant are the ones who have the final say in the decision-making process of the internship interviews, which places them in a position to determine or at least influence the future of the internship candidate.

This asymmetric distribution of rights makes the internship interviews describable as *gatekeeping* events that are characterised and analysed by Erickson & Schultz (1982), John Gumperz and Celia Roberts (Gumperz et al. 1979; Roberts et al. 1992; Roberts & Sarangi 1999b; Roberts et al. 2003; Roberts & Campbell 2005; Roberts & Campbell 2006; Campbell & Roberts 2007). The notion of gatekeeping and the way this relates to the internship interview will be discussed in section 2.3, but first it is necessary to examine the notion of asymmetry on a more general level and how various types of asymmetry can be said to be established and oriented to within the internship interview.

Some of these forms of asymmetry are related to the establishment of politicized social categories such as second language speaker, Danish and Muslim, others are related to the distribution of rights related to the establishment of the participation framework. In this sense the following subsection on asymmetry highlights some of the points made in relation to the characterisation of the speech situation and the participation framework of the internship

interview and hereby presents a conceptual bridge between the description of the local structuring of the internship interview so far presented in section 2.2 and the following consideration of the internship interview as a gatekeeping situation in section 2.3.

2.2.4 The Construction and Negotiation of Asymmetries

The notion of asymmetry refers to the unevenness of two comparable objects, or two comparable parts of one object, whether physical such as a face or a vase or, as in this case, a social phenomenon such as talk-in-interaction. In the case of physical objects, symmetry refers to an aesthetic or functional ideal and asymmetry refers to the deviation from this ideal such as a perceivable or measurable difference in size, colour or shape between two constituent parts of the object. In the case of social phenomena such as talk-in-interaction the notion of asymmetry is more problematic, since the object of reference is not conceivable as an absolute entity that can be measured nor straightforwardly divided in different ‘halves’.

The notion of asymmetry has been used in relation to talk-in-interaction and more specifically institutional interaction (Drew & Heritage 1992b; Sundberg 2004) and is used to refer to an asymmetry in the contributions of the various participants in such interactions. A specific interaction or form of interaction is considered to be ‘the whole’ and the contributions of different participants are ‘the constituent parts’ that are measured or analysed in relation to each other. This way of perceiving an interaction makes sense in light of the argumentative and dialogic nature of interaction as organised by the turn-taking system (see section 3.2.2). However, it does not solve the problem of how to measure and compare the different contributions.

Asymmetry and symmetry exist on various levels of verbal interaction, and one may in fact question whether an interaction is ever symmetric on any level. Whether comparing the amount of turns, words and TCU’s uttered or the actions made by various participants in interaction the general picture would most likely not be symmetric. However, this does not mean that one could not find patterns of symmetry and asymmetry on various levels that justifies the comparative endeavour and idea of some interactions or moments in interaction as more asymmetric than others.

The use of the word asymmetry is to be understood as an uneven distribution between the participants in interaction of rights and possibilities on various levels. When using the word asymmetry to describe some of the features of the internship interview, this is not to suggest that some interactions are fundamentally symmetric or that the notion of asymmetry is in itself

a meaningful criterion of analysis in interactional research. Rather, the word asymmetry is used to describe some patterns of actions and rights that manifest themselves in the internship interview at various levels and that can be said to, when oriented to and established, influence the interactional development and the process of meaning.

Asymmetry is not to be understood as something fixed or stable or as something predictable and unchallengeable. Rather, it is, like the notion of speech situation and participation framework something which is continually established and negotiated between participants in interaction. It is something that may be reproduced, reified and institutionalised to form patterns that potentially influence actions, situations and processes of meaning as it is associated with specific speech situations, participant roles and social categories. Asymmetry is in this way both an interactional achievement and a contextual basis for this achievement.

As illustrated in the previous analysis of the internship interview as a communicative event, there are asymmetries that are closely related to the establishment of the participation framework and the speech situation of the internship interview. On the interactional level one example of such asymmetry is the right to control the development of the interaction and the actions and purposes of the interactions; on a social level it is the ability to limit, enable and dictate the future behaviour and possibilities of the participants and on a cultural¹³ level to define normality and deviance. As already demonstrated, the participants oriented towards an asymmetry related to the establishment of the participant statuses of interviewer and employer.

In the introductory internship interview, this was effectuated in the employer being granted and claiming the right to change topics and ask questions on an interactional level and determine the future reality and conditions of the internship as well as the future behaviour of the internship candidate during the internship on the social level. Furthermore, the participants oriented towards the job consultant as having the right to contribute in defining the terms of the internship due to his/her knowledge and position as representative of the legislative framework regarding the internship candidates' unemployment and immigrant status. The participants also established the rights of the job consultant to speak on behalf of the internship candidate and to act as mediator between the internship candidate and the employer or employee. Finally, the participants established the internship candidates' rights to express their interests, needs and motivations in relation to the planning of the future internship interview, at least in the cases

¹³ Culture here refers to a shared community of meaning that encompasses processes of membership categorization as well as a range of shared structures of meaning and ideology that interties with such processes. For a more detailed description of this notion of culture see chapter 4.

where this was established as an already agreed future reality. In the cases where the internship was constructed as merely a potential future reality to be decided upon within the internship interview, the rights and participant status of the internship candidate was established by the participants as supplying information and evidence for their competence and ability to perform the tasks involved in the internship.

As shown previously, this summary of the distribution of rights between the participants in the internship interview does not represent the complexity of the interactional process in which these rights were established, negotiated and at times contested. However the purpose here is to paint a general picture of some of the asymmetries that characterise the internship interview on an interactional, social, and cultural level¹⁴.

Characterising the internship interview as a communicative event enables a revelation of any asymmetries that may be at stake on an institutional and social level. However, I would argue that it is not all forms of asymmetry, established within the internship interview that can be described through reference to the institutionality of an interaction. Or at least the institutional and interactional forms of asymmetry can be said to sometimes be interrelated with other forms of asymmetry related to the establishment and negotiation of membership categories that are associated with culturally and socially established meanings and hierarchies. Interactions can be influenced by asymmetries on not only an interactional and social level, but also on a cultural level.

As mentioned, the participants in the internship interview orient to membership categories other than those immediately related to the speech situation and the participation framework. The establishment of these other categories is found to involve the establishment of asymmetries that are not related to the institutionality of this speech situation but to broader structures of meaning and power. Throughout the various internship interviews, membership categories such as Danish, second-language speaker, Muslim and Colombian were established and made relevant and associated with a distribution of rights that can be said to establish and reproduce asymmetries on a broader cultural level involved shared structures of meaning and ideology.

The effect of these asymmetries did not manifest itself in isolation from the previously mentioned asymmetries and distribution of rights, but interplayed with these in complex and

¹⁴ It should be noted that the separation of these different levels is problematic in practice, not only in relation to asymmetry but in general as each level represents a dimension of social life that invariably involve or imply the others. The three levels described are in this way considered to be intimately related and mutually constitutive.

consequential ways. The complexity of this will be examined and illustrated further in chapter 5, but here the purpose is to argue that there are different levels of asymmetry at play within the internship interviews, one of which is related to the establishment membership categories that are broader in scope and often referred to as social categories or social identities. This observation is not new. Previous research on institutional native/non-native interaction (Jupp et al. 1982; Bremer et al. 1996; Sundberg 2004) describe these as characterised by an interactionally achieved asymmetry. Jupp et al. describe how linguistic interaction can either reinforce or alleviate distance, difference and stereotypes, and Svennevig (2004; 2005) describes how, in institutional interactions between clerks and non-native clients, the repetitions made by the native-speaking clerks show an orientation towards the linguistic asymmetry between the participants.

So far asymmetry has been described as an unequal distribution of rights and actions, which is interactionally established and manifested and can be described with reference to three different levels: an interactional level, a social level and a cultural and ideological level. As argued, the former two can be examined through a characterization of the interaction as a communicative event and is closely related to the membership categories established in relation to the participation framework and the speech situation. The latter, on the other hand, is not directly linked to the context of the speech situation but rather to the internship interview's embeddedness in a broader cultural context of meaning and it is manifested in relation to the participants' orientations towards membership categories that are not uniquely related to the context of the speech situation.

2.2.5 Situational Asymmetries, Discourse Asymmetries and Transportable Asymmetries

In a study of emergency calls, Don Zimmerman (1998) makes a similar distinction between various participant statuses, roles and identities that are established within interaction and linked to various levels of the interactional organisation and asymmetry. He uses the terms discourse identities, situational identities and transportable identities, where the first can be said to relate to the interactional level, the second to the social level and the third to the cultural level. The purpose of including Zimmerman's distinction between different identities in interaction is not to adapt his terms and I will therefore not engage in elaborate discussion of these terms. Instead, I will briefly describe his conceptualization of different levels of identity

corresponding with different levels of action since this resonates with my understanding of the way various forms of asymmetry is established and interrelated.

Zimmerman describes how *situational identities*, along with the institutional context, project a certain future development or overall structure of an interaction such as interrogation, interview, and medical examination. These identities remain constant throughout the entire interaction once they are established. In emergency calls for example, the situational identities are Caller and Call-taker. Situational identities do not, however, control the actual development and structure of an interaction - this depends on the actual actions and orientations of the participants and the way they project and infer what the participants are doing. The situational identities are in Zimmerman's words bound up with and related to the various *discourse identities* that the interlocutors enact in relation to their interactional goals (Zimmerman 1998:94).

Examples of discourse identities are questioner, hearer, accuser, defender, joker, inviter etc. and these identities shift throughout the interaction and are not specifically bound to the situational identities otherwise represented. However, they are not totally independent of them either since the situational identities make some actions more likely and expected than others. In a formal interview situation, the context and the situational identities prescribe that primarily one person will ask the questions, while the other is to respond.

Hence, there are different levels of dependency between the overall institutional context and the actual structure and development of an interaction. Nevertheless, the institutional context never completely determines an interaction and it is indeed possible to imagine for example a job-interview where the interviewee 'takes control' of the interaction, or alters its expected structure for example by aggressively asking questions to the interviewer or by not allowing interactional space for them to ask questions at all. On the other end of the scale an interviewee can act against what is expected of her/his identity as interviewee by not saying anything or refusing to answer the questions posed. Any institutional interaction is always subject to negotiation and demands the participation of all participants in order to follow a specific format.

In the internship interview the situational identity of employer, employee, job consultant and candidate were made relevant in the beginning of this interaction. Following Zimmerman, these situational identities continue to be relevant throughout the interaction and manifest themselves in the behaviour of the participants. In section 2.2.2, we saw how the participants

primarily oriented to the employer and the employee as the ones to ask questions and to the internship candidate as the one to answer. The job consultant was established as facilitator and mediator. In the following extract it is clear how these situational identities can be said to interrelate with the discourse identities of questioner and answerer. Such a distribution of tasks can in itself be said to be asymmetric in the sense that the employer and the employee are privileged with the right to control the development of the interaction. The extract furthermore shows how the rights associated with the situational identities enable an orientation towards transportable identities that in itself effectuates asymmetries on a cultural and ideological level.

Extract 28: So You Both Have To Learn Danish?

12
13 *EM: Er din mand også fra I:ran, (very thoroughly pronounced)
14 Is your husband also from I:ran
15
16 *IN: ja
17 yes
18
19 |*EM: ja
20 yes
21
22 *IN: ja=
23 yes=
24
25 *EM: =[.tsk] •
26 =[.tsk]
27
28 () [.hja]
29 [.h]yeah
30
31 *EM: så skal I begge [to lære fdansk? =
32 so you both have [to learn fdanish?=
33
34 *IN: [han kommer (ja/her)= •
35 [he comes (yes/here)=
36
37 *EM: =[sk.ha] [()]=
38 =[sk.ha] [()]=
39
40 *IN: =[ja] ha ha [ha]=
41 =[yes]ha ha [ha]=
42
43 *CO: =[Nej han har]boet her i mange år. •
44 =[no he has] lived here for many years
45
46 *IN: =[ja::]
47 =[ye::s
48
49 *EM: Nå han har [boet her i mange år okay]
50 oh he has [lived here for many years okay]
51
52 (CO/IN:) [ja () også] boet [her]
53 [yes() also] lived [here]

The extract will be analyzed in greater detail in section 5.4 here I merely want point to the fact that EM uses the previously established situational identity of interviewer to claim the discourse identity of questioner and to make the transportable identity of Iranian relevant. Following the consistency rule she simultaneously makes the category Danish relevant, and in line 31 she uses her transportable identity of Danish and native Danish speaker to normatively prescribe a certain behaviour on IN's behalf. Hence, the asymmetry invoked through the

orientation towards the transportable identities of Iranian, Danish, native-speaker and second-language speaker is established on the grounds of privileges and rights associated with the situational identity of interviewer and made possible through the discourse identity of questioner.

Zimmerman describes how the initial actions of the interlocutors in emergency calls establish a set of mutually oriented-to identities which projects the future development of the call. Using Goffmann he refers to these initial actions as establishing the ‘footing’ for the following (Zimmerman 1998:98). The change taking place in this extract from inquiring about the personal background of the candidate to discussing learning Danish as a second language in relation to the situation of the candidate’s husband can be said to represent a change of footing in the interaction from a formal format to a small-talk format which is used as a platform to dictate the behaviour of IN. While small-talk can be said to be an important dimension of the speech situation of the internship interview, EM seems to take on the role of arbiter of IN’s future here. The fact that EM changes the footing to a more informal, friendly conversation does not, however, make the interaction less asymmetric or make the participants more equal. Even though the reply of the candidate is designed in a preferred way and seems to encourage the employee to continue along the same lines, a future development in which the topicalisation of the candidate’s Danish skills is central is simultaneously projected. This brings Zimmerman’s (1998:91) concept of the transportable identity of second-language speaker to the fore, while simultaneously making the situational identity of candidate less relevant. While the friendliness mitigates the asymmetry following from the institutionality of the interaction, the foregrounding of a transportable identity which highlights a lack in competence reiterates the asymmetry. Now, if the employer had not picked up on the topicalisation of Danish skills and the transportable identity of second-language speaker but continued the friendly small-talk instead, the development in the extract might have been different. But the Employer takes the floor and poses a rather normative first-pair part and an authoritative follow-up response, which displays the abandonment of the friendly, conversational ‘footing’ and the discourse identity of accuser. Asymmetry can therefore not be said to merely be related to situational identities and institutional interactions as such, but to the way these situational identities and institutional settings are managed turn-by-turn. Furthermore, it is related to the transportable identities that are made relevant during the interaction, which can make other situational and discourse identities less relevant. This is, in other words, an excellent example of the

interrelatedness of the interactional, social and cultural/ideological level of asymmetry previously mentioned and of how the various levels of participant roles and identities relate to different levels of actions.

From the analysis of this extract it may appear as if asymmetry, whether institutional or non-institutional, is something which is imposed by the employer and the employee on the internship candidate, but from an interactional perspective, this is only part of the story. All meanings, actions, identities and the overall footing and context of an interaction, including asymmetries and symmetries, alignments and misalignments, affiliations and disaffiliations are co-constructed and negotiated between the participants. When asymmetry is established, this means that the actions of all participants in direct and indirect ways contribute to this establishment. In the previous example, IN was in this way contributing to the establishment of interactional and social asymmetry by, through her actions and orientations, establishing the situational identity of interviewee. She was also contributing to the cultural and ideological by aligning with and answering the questions regarding her husband, their nationality and her language abilities and practices. The job consultant, however, was doing the opposite, namely confronting the implications of the questions, being disaffiliating in her responses, and hereby challenging and negotiating the assumptions and the asymmetry potentially established by EM and HO and challenging their discourse identities of accuser or questioner. I will not go further into the role of the job consultant here, since it will be elaborated in the analysis in chapter 5, but merely point this out as an example of how various levels of asymmetry are co-constructed and can therefore be confronted. The following extract shows an example of how the internship candidate was at times able to confront the cultural and ideological asymmetry associated with the orientation towards the category of second language speaker. The extract will be more thoroughly examined in section chapter 5.

Extract 29: Do You Understand What I'm Saying?

63 (.)
64 *HO: .hh [neɪ] .hh er det svært f- øh kan du forstå
65 .hh [no] .hh is it difficult f- eh can you understand
66
67 *IN: ['kay]
68 [right]
69
70 *HO: hvad jeg siger •
71 what I am saying
72
73 *IN: ɛɪAAAɛɪ •
74 ɛYEESɛɪ
75
76 *HO: >ɛDet godtɛ<
77 >ɛThat's goodɛ<
78
79 *IN: h[hundrede procent heh. heh. he. jah.][heh. heh. .hhhh] •
80 h[hundred percent heh. heh. he. jah.][heh. heh. .hhhh]
81
82 *HO: [heh. heh. he. he. he.]
83 [heh. heh. he. he. he.]
84

In line 64 HO makes the category of second language speaker relevant by questioning IN's understanding of his previous turns, and IN rejects this implication in line 73 in a way that can be said to be orienting to the asymmetry that this entails. By using emphasis and loud voice she is being assertive, rather than merely responsive and her utterance hereby works as a criticism of the preceding question and projects that some sort of excuse, account or explanation for HO's question is to follow. At the same time, the assertiveness is done in a smile voice, which mitigates the implied criticism and rejection. Although HO does not explicitly respond by giving an excuse or account, he orients to the assertiveness and the rejection by giving a quick satisfied third turn response in line 76, also in smile voice. In this manner, he immediately diminishes the negative thrust of his previous question and closes the topic on a positive note. Although HO has thus signalled that he will not pursue the topic further, IN continues and upgrades her rejection of HO's question in line 79 by saying 'a hundred percent', which is a contemporary and vernacular way of saying completely. Hereby she demonstrates familiarity with formulaic phrases used by native speakers of Danish. So by combining prosodic features such as emphasis, loud voice, smile voice and laughter with a formulaic phrase, IN manages to confront the projected asymmetry.

Whether IN manages to confront asymmetry at all levels mentioned or only the asymmetry established on an interactional level is debatable. By constructing a defence against her assumed linguistic incompetence, she is not in any way challenging the social asymmetry associated with the employer's rights to limit or enable her future actions and behaviour as an

intern. For this to happen she would have to engage in negotiations about the nature and conditions of this internship or refuse the internship altogether.

With respect to the asymmetry at play on a cultural/ideological level her defence potentially confronts the association EM makes between the membership category of ‘foreigner’ and a low level of language competence. More broadly speaking, her actions can be seen to potentially disturb or challenge, although not change, established structures of meaning around foreigners and second language speakers in Denmark. In Bakhtin’s terms (Bakhtin 1981:270-272; see also Fairclough 1995), her utterance can be said to work with the centrifugal forces of language rather than the centripetal¹⁵ in the sense that she challenges established patterns of meaning by countering EM’s assumption and preconceived notion of her.

What this discussion of asymmetry has attempted to highlight is that asymmetry on various levels is manifested throughout the various internship interviews and that some of these levels are more constant and less susceptible to challenge and confrontation. No interaction is likely to change well-established structures of meaning and social hierarchies, but at the same time such meanings and hierarchies need to be constantly reproduced in order to survive in the long run and as such they can be potentially challenged in interactional processes of meaning.

This does not, however, change the fact that the participants within an interaction such as the internship interview, construct and commit to a certain distribution of rights on social level, as they establish the speech situation, such as the employers right to accept or reject the internship candidate and the job consultants right to influence the formal agreement between the parties. This is partly related to the stability of situational identities as described by Zimmerman but not least related to the fact that the internship is a gatekeeping interaction, which is a specific type of institutional speech situation that will be described in the following section.

2.3 A Gatekeeping Situation

In this chapter, I have so far described how the participants’ establishment of the speech situation of the internship interview involves, among other things, the assessment of the internship candidate and decision-making with respect to the future of the internship.

¹⁵ See section 4.5.6 for an elaboration of the perspective of Bakhtin and the notions of centrifugal and centripetal forces of language.

Moreover, I have argued that this assessment and decision-making involves both membership categories like ‘internship candidate’, ‘employer’ and ‘job consultant’ and broader social categories such as ‘Muslim’, ‘Danish’ and ‘Iranian’. In this section I will discuss the notion of gatekeeping in relation to the internship interview and argue that it can be used to highlight the processes of exclusion and inclusion that the internship interview can be said to involve at various levels.

Gatekeeping as a theoretical term was first used and defined by anthropologists Frederick Erickson and Jeffrey Schultz in 1982 in the following way:

... brief encounters in which two persons meet, usually as strangers, with one of them having authority to make decisions that affect the other’s future (Erickson & Schultz 1982:xi)

This definition can be used to categorise a range of different institutional encounters as gatekeeping encounters such as job-interviews (Jupp et al. 1982; Adelswärd 1988; Auer 1998; Scheuer 2001; Roberts & Campbell 2006), Counsellor interactions (Erickson & Schultz 1982), Appraisal Interviews (Trads 2000), Report-card meetings (Mazeland & Berenst 2006) and public service consultations (Svennevig 2001). These are all interactions where one of the participants has the right, authority and obligation to make decisions about another participant, and where the outcome of this has direct and concrete consequences for this person. The internship interview can also be described as a gatekeeping encounter, but as described previously in this chapter the goals and the participant statuses of the participants are not as clearly defined or established as in other gatekeeping encounters. So including the internship interview in this category calls for further justification and explanation.

First of all the internship interview is not an event in which the guilt or innocence, the academic passing or failing, the health care provision or neglect, the welfare provision or refusal, or the employment of an individual is decided. As described previously in this chapter, the decision to accept an intern was already made by the employers prior to meeting the candidate. Consequently, the interviews were not decision-making events as such, but rather an opportunity to get acquainted and finally approve the candidate in question. Although the employers were perfectly able and entitled to decide against a future internship after having met the candidate, none of the internship candidates were rejected on the basis of the interview. Nevertheless, the participants are orienting to and establishing decision-making as one of the purposes and activities of the internship interview. Furthermore, they are orienting to the

employer as having the authority and power to make this decision. In this respect the internship interview can be categorised as a gatekeeping encounter.

There is a second problem with describing the internship interview as a gatekeeping encounter as defined by Erickson and Schultz, namely that the affect of the decision made by the employer, prior to or during the interview is not as straightforward and concrete as is the case in the counsellor sessions they describe. In the case of a job-interview as described by Roberts (Roberts & Campbell 2006) or the counsellor meetings described by Erickson and Schultz (Erickson & Schultz 1982) the decision-making and the evaluative practices are clearly and substantially influential to the candidate or the student. In the case of the internship interview on the other hand, the decision-making is not as explicitly influential to the future of the candidate, since what is being offered is not a regular job but a temporary, unpaid internship that will not necessarily ensure an ordinary job, a monthly salary and a way out of the welfare system. The fact that the stakes are, in this respect, not as high as in other gatekeeping encounters potentially changes the power-relation between the participants in a way that diminishes the authority and power of the employer and makes the internship candidate less dependent and victimized. Or in other words the 'gates' are less of a problem, if there is no interest in what lies behind them.

As described and illustrated in the analysis above, this was, however, not the case. The participants, including the internship candidates, oriented to the internship and the internship interview as important and influential in relation to their future employment possibilities, professional development and language acquisition. The previously shown extract below is an example of how some of the candidates displayed an orientation towards the interaction as important and consequential, and towards the employer and the employee as decision-makers or gatekeepers.

Extract 13: That is where You will Be (repeated extract)

12 *EM: ja det er mig der (0.8) står for køkken og
13 madlavning og frivillige og ja den mobile cafe som sådan og alt det
14 der foregår der
15
16 yes it is me who (0.8) is in charge of the kitchen and
17 cooking and volunteers and yes the mobile cafe as such and all that
18 goes on there
19 (0.5)
20 *EM: og det er jo så der hvor (0.4) du skal være
21 and this is then there where (0.4) you will be
22
23 *IN: ja hehe
24 yes hehe
25
26 *EM: være med
27 be with
28
29 *IN: det håber jeg [he he he .hh
30 I hope so [he he he .hh
31

The employment conditions for immigrants and refugees are difficult and internships are used as a point of entry into the labour market to a great extent. For this reason, getting an internship influences the future employment prospects and economic security of the candidate indirectly. This is perhaps even more so in the case of born abroad job-seekers for whom the regular path to ordinary employment is hindered by the fact that their qualifications and work-experiences are often not directly applicable and acceptable within the new work context. Furthermore, the application process is, for BA job-seekers, often complicated by language barriers and a possible lack of familiarity with the recruitment and application procedures and the general cultural codes, norms and conventions of the new country of residence. While the internship does not in any way solve these problems, it constitutes a point of entry into the labour market. The intern may gain professional experience and training, a professional network and insight into application and recruitment procedures. In this respect the internship interview may be a quite important and consequential communicative event, at least for the person being interviewed and in this sense it is similar to the counsellor – student interactions that Erickson and Schultz describe as gate-keeping interactions.

Another factor that contributes to raising the stakes of the internship is the fact that in Denmark internships have increasingly become an obligatory element in the ‘activity plan’ for immigrants. An ‘activity plan’, or ‘aktiveringsforløb’ as it is called in Danish, is a programme designed individually by a social worker in cooperation with the unemployed. The aim is to qualify, prepare and aid the citizen to enter into the labour market. Apart from an internship, the plan may include various courses such as computer-courses, driving courses, hygiene courses, language training, job-counselling and visits to different work-places etc. This means that the internship and the internship interview, apart from being a possible step towards

ordinary employment, is an obligatory part of an activity plan that the immigrant or refugee is required to follow in order to receive welfare. In this way the internship is a last resort and alternative to the less favourable situation of getting no financial support, or being forced to undertake any job available and appointed by the municipality – a job that is not necessarily related to the experience, qualifications and wishes of the citizen in any way.

In sum, the internship interview may well be considered a gatekeeping encounter as defined by Erickson and Schultz. Even though the internship has already been established and agreed upon prior to the internship interview, the candidates but sometimes also the employers orient towards the interview as an evaluative and selective encounter and to the employer as having the authority and power to grant the internship candidate access to the labour market, professional development and improvement of language skills.

The problem with the definition offered by Erickson and Schultz is, however, that it primarily serves a descriptive purpose in that it may be used to determine whether a given interaction is a gatekeeping encounter or not. Although the term is useful in pointing to the power-dimension of interaction and bringing attention to the fact that some interactions are central to assuring or preventing an even distribution of goods and services, the term itself does not reveal much about the actual processes in which this occurs. There is a need to define gatekeeping as the actual process in which inequality is produced, rather than the types of encounters in which it occurs. This will be the object of the remaining part of this section and will involve a closer review of some of the previous studies of gatekeeping.

2.3.1 The Initial Studies of Gatekeeping

In Erickson and Schultz' study of gatekeeping in student counselling sessions, they showed that the amount and type of information given to college students depended on whether or not moments of asynchrony occurred during the interaction, which again was found to correlate with the ethnicity of the students and the ability of the participants to find a common frame of reference and experience (Erickson & Schultz 1982; Gumperz 1982:142). Thus, their study illuminates how the establishment of co-membership and interpersonal solidarity is influential to the development of an interaction and that such establishment is dependent on the normative social identity of the participant (i.e. ethnicity, race), the performed social identity (i.e. locally established) and the cultural communication style of the participants (Erickson & Schultz 1982:179).

The definition of gatekeeping offered in this study pointed to a specific type of interactions where the decision-making of one person influenced the future of another. However, the actual study reveals an understanding of gatekeeping encounters as interactions in which an implicit process of inclusion and exclusion occur. This process is conceptualised as related to the establishment of co-membership and interpersonal solidarity, which is closely related to interpretative and constructive processes of identity. What is problematic with Erickson and Schultz' definition of gatekeeping is that it points to the places where gatekeeping can be found without referring to the actual phenomenon of gatekeeping as it is described in the study.

Another central figure in studies of gatekeeping encounters is the anthropologist John Gumperz, who spent ten years doing field studies on communication in India, Europe and USA. Moreover, he has used linguistic studies of Hindi/Urdu as the backdrop for interactional studies of simulated job-interviews in Britain between English speakers from different cultural backgrounds using different language varieties and accents (Gumperz et al. 1979; Gumperz 1982). His central argument is that there is a linguistic dimension to discrimination in the sense that people with a different language and cultural background than the majority are disadvantaged in encounters with members of the majority, since their culturally specific communicative styles and interpretative assumptions potentially hinder successful communication. Hence, Gumperz highlights how processes of interpretation and inference are influenced by cultural norms and assumptions that participants bring into an interaction (Roberts et al. 1992:88-89). The gatekeeping aspect of such processes was considered to be the way that differences in cultural norms and assumptions implicitly influenced the decision-making process of the interviewers.

The study by Gumperz was focusing on inter-cultural differences between applicants with an Indian and a British background whereas the study by Erickson and Schultz focused on inter-ethnic differences between black or white Americans but both studies emphasise how the establishment of rapport, 'interpersonal solidarity' or 'co-membership' is influential to the decision-making process and influenced by differences of interpretation and communicative style.

Gumperz also supervised a study carried out by Akinnaso and Ajiroto (Akinnaso & Seabrook Ajiroto 1982) of simulated inter-ethnic job-interviews at a job-training centre in Oakland, California in 1978. Much like Gumperz' work, their study focused on the way

differences in interpretative framework and communicative norms influenced the performance and judgement of ethnic minority candidates. Akinnaso and Ajirotutu found that the ethnic background and the communicative history of the candidates caused mismatches between the conversational mode expected by the interviewer and the ones used by the candidates. Furthermore, they argued that culturally specific discourse features related to narrative structure influenced the assessment of the candidates negatively (Akinnaso & Seabrook Ajirotutu 1982:135).

Although the studies performed and supervised by Gumperz focused on misunderstandings and mismatches rather than the establishment of solidarity and co-membership, they reveal a similar approach to gatekeeping as found in the study of Erickson and Schultz, namely as an implicit process of inclusion and exclusion related to processes of interpretation and the establishment and negotiation of social identity. The problem with such an approach to gatekeeping, besides the fact that it is not defined as a phenomenon but a type of interaction, is that it situates processes of gatekeeping in the interpretative process, or the participants' minds rather than in their actions and utterances in the interaction.

By conceptualising gatekeeping as a side-effect of an interpretative process, it can only be revealed by comparing interactional analysis with a quantitative analysis of the relation between ethnic identity and a specific interactional outcome or by combining the interactional analysis of processes of decision-making and assessment with interviews about such processes. In the former case, which is the methodology of Erickson and Schultz, the correlation between specific interactional findings and a specific interactional outcome is used to infer a discriminative interpretative practice.

In the latter case, which represents the methodology of Gumperz, discrimination in job-interviews is based on a correlation between interactional findings, an interactional outcome and the participants' stated impressions, interpretations and understandings of the interviews and the candidates. While the results generated by the study of Erickson and Schultz as well as the studies by Gumperz were important, persuasive and ground-breaking in revealing processes of discrimination and gatekeeping in interaction, they did not formulate and identify gatekeeping as an interactional phenomenon as such. Instead, they conceive gatekeeping as an interpretative and cognitive phenomenon triggered by cultural and ethnic differences in communicative style and interpretative frameworks.

2.3.2 Gatekeeping in Interactional Sociolinguistics

Gumperz' work on job-interviews and Erickson's & Schultz' study of counselling interviews laid the ground for an entire field of research in gatekeeping interactions under the heading of Interactional Sociolinguistics, which represents a form of bridge-building between the micro-analysis of Conversation Analysis and the contextually informed perspective of ethnography (Roberts & Sarangi 1999a:13). A range of studies on gatekeeping interactions have been undertaken since the work of Gumperz, mainly by theorists such as Srikant Sarangi and not least Celia Roberts who has carried on Gumperz work on various forms of intercultural gatekeeping interactions, inspired by Conversation Analysis, Ethnography and Critical Discourse Analysis (See Jupp et al. 1982; Roberts et al. 1992; Roberts & Sarangi 1999c; Roberts et al. 2003; Roberts et al. 2004; Roberts et al. 2005; Roberts & Sarangi 2005; Roberts & Campbell 2006).

During the 1970'ies and 1980'ies, Roberts and a team of other researchers were involved in a study on Communication in Multi-ethnic Workplaces in relation to UK Industrial Language Training Service (ILT) (Jupp et al. 1982; Roberts et al. 1992), which Gumperz also became involved in (Gumperz et al. 1979). This Language Training Service, which was basically situating English language training and cross-cultural training at the work-place, was a response to a need for ethnic-minority workers to improve their language skills under conditions that were compatible with their often long work-days and odd schedules. During the 15 years in which this service existed, it was the site of much educational research and practice and the source of some important insights about inter-ethnic communication in work-place settings, institutional discrimination and gate-keeping (Roberts et al. 1992). The researchers worked with simulated job-interviews and used the findings from these as a basis for developing practice-oriented language training methods. The findings included problems with the expectations and inferences of the participants, a lack of knowledge of the interviewing structure among the candidates and lack of awareness of these problems among the interviewers(Jupp et al. 1982).

In 1999 Roberts and Sarangi did a study on oral examinations for general practitioners with the aim of finding out whether the oral exam as such was in subtle ways disadvantaging ethnic minority candidates, who were documented as relatively less successful (Roberts & Sarangi 1999c:477). What they found was that in order to display the values and attitudes required by the examiners, the candidates had to use and integrate three different modes of

talk: a professional, an institutional and a personal, and the failure of candidates to present themselves in an appropriate way was related to mis-matches between the discourses elicited by the examiners and the ones used by candidates or to difficulties in blending these different modes of talk in the right way.

Some students would be too personal, when what the examiner was looking for was a more analytical and distanced answer. Alternatively, they would fail to integrate a personal perspective into the more professional and analytical answers. What is highlighted by this study is the way that moment-by-moment interpretations and actions during an interaction are influenced by ideological assumptions and expectations about the participants in the interaction, as well as the interaction as a social activity as such (Roberts & Sarangi 1999c:479). The fact that gatekeeping interactions are not only explicit sites of assessment but implicit sites of negotiation about the basis of this assessment potentially makes it more difficult for candidates who have different institutional, professional and cultural experiences as well as a different first language.

In 2003 Roberts et al. (Roberts et al. 2003; Roberts et al. 2004; Roberts et al. 2005; Roberts & Sarangi 2005) carried out another larger project on interactions between Patients with Limited English and Doctors in General Practice (PLEDGE) in Southern London. The purpose was to investigate interactional problems arising from differences in communicative styles as expressed in the opening sequences of medical consultations with patients from non-English speaking backgrounds and people who use a non-standard variety of English. In contrast to some of the other studies mentioned, this study did not explicitly focus on processes of gatekeeping or discrimination, but aimed at identifying barriers for equal access to a specific social service, namely medical services, and the resources that were or could be used to overcome such barriers. The study highlighted how deviations from a given institutionalised interactional order and behaviour creates interactional problems that require extra interactional work which presents a barrier for equal access to medical service. The conclusion to be drawn from this in relation to gatekeeping is paradoxical, namely that the equal treatment of patients regardless of linguistic or cultural background will result in the disadvantage of those patients that have a different communicative style than the majority. Thus, gatekeeping is highlighted as a potential outcome of processes of differentiation as well as processes of unification where everyone is treated in the same way without regards to potential differences.

The most recent study of gatekeeping was a study on British job-interviews for low-income and manual jobs, carried out by Roberts and Campbell (Roberts & Campbell 2005; Roberts & Campbell 2006; Campbell & Roberts 2007). This study was the biggest and most elaborate study made on naturally occurring inter-ethnic job-interviews, and the findings and arguments supplement and substantiate those from the 1999 study on oral examination exams. The purpose of the study was to compare the achievement of British candidates, with British born ethnic minority candidates and born abroad (BA) ethnic minority candidates to see whether indirect or direct discrimination between the three groups took place.

What they found was that although no overt discrimination of candidates with ethnic minority background took place, the BA candidates suffered a linguistic penalty in relation to the British born ethnic minority candidates and the British candidates. They describe this penalty as related to two factors: Competence frameworks and equal opportunities frameworks. Competence frameworks force the candidates to present themselves in accordance with certain institutional, occupational and personal discourses that are not necessarily familiar to born abroad candidates. Equal opportunities frameworks, while developed to insure the equality of the various candidates through the interviewing process, impose demands on candidates to present themselves in ways that are less conversational, since they do not allow for interviewers to respond to or aid the performance of the candidates. While this type of assessment may be equal it is not fair, since it disadvantages candidates who are less familiar with formal and institutional vocabulary and discourse.

Roberts and Campbell's study offers a valuable critique of the assumption that linguistic ability is the central cause of misunderstandings and communicative problems. They argue that linguistic ability should not be seen as something fixed which can be un-problematically measured or evaluated by interviewers but is rather shifting and interactionally produced. Inspired by Bourdieu, they argue that interactions such as the job-interview require linguistic capital, which the born abroad candidates are not always in possession of. They suggest that the linguistic capital needed in the job-interviews studied is first of all the ability to produce responses with an appropriate mix of personal, institutional and occupational discourse, and secondly the ability to produce coherent, consistent and credible talk. The problems of misalignments, reformulations and misunderstandings that Roberts and Campbell find in higher proportion in the interviews with BA candidates are in this way explained as a result of

a lack of shared assumptions and knowledge about the demands of the interview and the indirect way that the interviewers indicated their intentions.

While the notion of shared assumptions is problematic due to its systemic and absolutist connotations, the study of Roberts and Campbell brings attention to the potential importance of the different cultural, linguistic and social resources that the individual imports into an interaction. Having said this, it is problematic to attempt to define assumptions as properties of individuals and the causes of specific outcomes of a specific interaction. Meaning is established between people of different experiences and even different languages every day, just like breakdowns in communication and the creation of meaning occur every day between people who share language, background and have been close for many years. While the co-construction of meaning or misalignments can certainly be explained in terms of how they occur, it is a much more speculative and problematic endeavour to explain such findings by reference to general levels of sharedness. What can however be described is the level of sharedness, which is established in a particular interaction, and the interactional process through which this occurs.

What is central in this latest study by Roberts compared to the previously mentioned studies by Gumperz is that the resources for interpreting and producing meaningful actions applied by the participants are not are not considered properties of a specific national, linguistic or ethnic group. Rather they are considered as linguistic capital related to a specific speech situation, namely the job-interview that a given individual may or may not have access to and use regardless of ethnic, linguistic or national group membership. Actions and interpretations are to a larger extent considered to be determined by a specific speech situation and the context within which it occurs than by a particular social identity of the participants.

The studies on gatekeeping within the field of interactional sociolinguistics highlight the importance of having access to appropriate and relevant social, cultural and linguistic knowledge to produce and interpret meaning in interaction, and they illustrate how some of the knowledge required is highly specific to the context of interaction. They also show how the contextualisation cues supplied as to what knowledge is needed at various moments in interaction and what responses and actions are expected accordingly are often very indirect and non-transparent. Roberts and Campbell in this way argue that many of the ‘discourse misalignments’ that occurred during the job-interviews were triggered by the lack of transparency in the interviewer’s way of asking questions in the sense that they would ask a

question that seemed to invite a personally formatted type of answer while actually expecting a more analytical answer. Similarly Akinnaso et al. highlight the indirectness of questions in job-interviews and of the culturally specific ways in which the intentions and expectations of interviewers are signalled as some of the central problems in interethnic gatekeeping encounters (Akinnaso & Seabrook Ajirotutu 1982:127).

These studies on gatekeeping in this way link an emphasis on the communicative and interpretative resources that the participants bring into play with the study of the interactional behaviour of the participants in order to describe some of the problems that can arise in inter-ethnic or inter-cultural communication. The purpose of much research within this area is to identify the strategies that are or could be successfully employed to overcome or solve some of these problems with a lack of sharedness.

From a conversation analytical point of view there is reason to be cautious of explaining interactional misalignments, misunderstandings and break-downs in communication with abstract notions such as discourse, shared assumptions and linguistic capital or ability. Part of this reason is related to a reservation within conversation analysis about the way that interactional sociolinguists use ethnographic methods in order to reveal the intentions and expectations of the participants (Akinnaso & Seabrook Ajirotutu 1982:133), which is what enables them to relate the interactional context with the individual context of knowledge, ability and resources.

Another problem that is particularly prevalent in some of the first studies of gatekeeping is that many of them are based on simulated interactional data (Gumperz et al. 1979; Akinnaso & Seabrook Ajirotutu 1982; Auer 1998) which were staged and analysed in ways which tried to control the speech situation in order to compare the performance of the candidates (Akinnaso & Seabrook Ajirotutu 1982:132). From an interactional perspective, this attempt to control and stage interactional behaviour is problematic, as it does not allow much insight into the actions and behaviour of candidates or interviewers in real life situations.

A third objection which can be made from a conversation analytical perspective is the emphasis on partially preconceived levels of sharedness or rather lack of sharedness of interactional, social and cultural norms and conventions between the participants. While many of the mentioned studies of inter-ethnic gatekeeping encounters illustrate manifestations of lack of sharedness or at least document differences in the interactional behaviour, such differences are attributed to certain group memberships and social categorisations of the

participants without taking other alternative categories that may be potentially relevant for the participants into account.

The methodological position advocated in this dissertation thus differs, as described in section 1.4, from many of the mentioned studies of gatekeeping, both with respect to the data studied, which is natural rather than simulated, and with respect to the emphasis placed on ethnographic data. Most importantly, it differs with respect to the overall research questions, which are far more focused on the interactional production of social categories, similarity and difference than on the way that pre-established categories and differences influence interactional behaviour. While the analysis in this thesis thus aligns more with the interactional than the ethnographic dimension of the above mentioned studies on gatekeeping, the emphasis on the relationship between what is produced in interaction and what is used as resources in interaction is however adapted. This position and the methodological framework that is used to defend this adaptation were described in chapter 1 and will be elaborated further in section 3.3.1. Here the focus is on how gatekeeping can be meaningfully defined and studied within the theoretical framework of conversation analysis and discursive psychology.

2.3.3 Related Studies of Inter-Group ‘Gatekeeping Encounters’

The research on gatekeeping mentioned above has inspired the study of various forms of inter-group communication within sociolinguistics and conversation analysis. The theoretical and methodological positions of these studies vary from CA, discourse analysis, sociolinguistics and ethnography, but they all focus on problems or differences in communication between different cultural, ethnic or social groups in institutional ‘gatekeeping’ encounters.

Within the sociolinguistic field, Peter Auer’s study (Auer 1998; Auer & Kern 2001) of the different communicative styles of East and West German job-seekers in role-played job-interviews should be mentioned as an example of a gatekeeping study that follows the emphasis on inter-group differences in communicative style found in the gatekeeping studies described previously. Auer describes how the East German job-seekers used a distinctively more formal and de-agentivised style employing elements from the official style of the German Democratic Republic. Auer furthermore showed how they used these elements in a quoting manner, which he argued revealed the influence of the hegemonic presence of a western communicative style. Auer’s study is interesting and important in the way that it accentuates the way in which social and cultural transformations manifest themselves in and present new demands for interactional and linguistic behaviour. He highlights how a broader cultural, social

and ideological context influences the actions and behaviour of the participants and affects processes of decision-making and evaluation. Although Auer reproduces the inter-group perspective on communication that is prevalent in studies of gatekeeping, he, like Roberts, introduces an ideological dimension. He shows that interactional behaviour is not determined by group membership. Rather, it is highly influenced by participant orientations towards the speech situation and the structures of meaning and ideology in which it is embedded. This thesis does not focus on the communicative style of the participants and how it affects processes of decision-making and evaluation, but concentrates on how ideology and structures of meaning influence and manifest themselves in processes of membership categorisation. This perspective will be explored in chapter 3 and chapter 5.

Within a Scandinavian context, Jan Scheuer and Viveka Adelswärd have repeated the line of argument of Gumperz and Auer that communicative style is related to the success of candidates in job-interviews (Scheuer 2001), but contrary to Gumperz, Erickson & Schultz, Auer and Roberts they focus on gender and class rather than ethnicity.

Scheuer's study is inspired by Ruth Wodak's discourse sociolinguistics and Viveka Adelswärd's quantitative studies, and he argues that a certain communicative style and discourse strategy, which he summarizes as an egalitarian, personalized performative style (Scheuer 2001:228), is more successful than others. Like some of the studies by Roberts, Scheuer's study emphasises the appropriate and inappropriate use of discourses within a job-interview setting and the incompatibility of some discourses (Scheuer 2001:233). The relative success of the candidates in integrating and using the various discourses and styles is then related to the socialization and background of the candidates and more specifically to the social parameter of class (Scheuer 2001:239). Scheuer concludes that: "*The job-interviews do not distinguish between individuals, but rather between types of communicative socialization*" (Scheuer 2001:240).

While Auer, Scheuer and Adelswärd, like the earlier gatekeeping studies, focus on communicative style and performance of the candidates in relation to the norms and conventions of the job-interview, the emphasis in this thesis is on the construction of meaning and categories and the way such constructions are embedded in and manifestations of a broader context of meaning and ideology. From this perspective, social categories related to gender, ethnicity or nationality and the membership of such categories are not considered as

explanations for actions, behaviours and interpretations but rather their products. This distinction calls for further elaboration.

The study of gatekeeping has since the early studies by Erickson & Schultz and John Gumperz been focused on interactions between people belong to different groups. When Roberts, Auer, Scheuer and Adelswärd all take their analytical point of departure in the grouping of the participants into social categories, namely male and female, East-German and West-German and investigate the performance, behaviour and style associated with these categories, they are inspired by the early studies of gatekeeping and by predominant methods within sociolinguistics, interactional sociolinguistics and ethnography of speaking. While the various theorists carrying out these types of comparative studies all consider and make reservations about the inherent reductionism of such categorisations, they share the goal of describing the relation between the behaviour of individuals and the history of linguistic and cultural socialization and practice of these individuals as members of specific groups.

While many of these theorists in other words deal with and acknowledge social and cultural categories as performed in interaction, they focus primarily on characterizing the culturally and socially routinised aspects of behaviour that are not necessarily oriented to explicitly by the participants but can nevertheless be identified as patterns of behaviour related to group or category membership. The following quote by Auer demonstrates the predominant position and focus within the majority of studies on gatekeeping.

It would be clearly be inadequate to restrict the notion of interculturality to more or less explicit orientations towards cultural categories. In fact, the most prototypical cases of intercultural misunderstandings described in the linguistic and anthropological literature are based on the very opposite assumption, i.e., that speakers are unaware of the culturally constrained ways in which they speak, and that they may not orient themselves at all (and definitely not explicitly) to their co-participants' divergent cultural background...Culturality can also be more implicitly produced on the level of the participants' diverging performances and their interlocutors' interpretations of them (Auer & Kern 2001:97).

While these studies have contributed immensely to the illumination and documentation of distinct patterns of behaviour of various social and cultural groups, they all focus predominantly on communicative style, misunderstandings and discursive mismatches and show no interest in revealing how different group memberships are made relevant, established and oriented to by the participants and how this in itself constitute processes of inclusion and inclusion.

2.3.4 CA Approaches to Inter-Group ‘Gatekeeping Encounters’

In recent years another type of interactional studies of ‘gatekeeping encounters’, as defined by Erickson and Schultz, have begun to appear. These studies take a somewhat different point of departure that is more inspired by the inductive method of conversation analysis and focus less on communicative problems and more on strategies for social organisation and understanding. In such studies the cultural, ethnic or social group membership of the participants is not the object of research as in the previously described studies of gatekeeping. Furthermore, although the speech situations studied can be described and categorised as gatekeeping encounters, gatekeeping as a phenomenon is not the primary focus, if considered at all.

Jan Svennevig’s (2004; 2005) study of repetition and reformulation as strategies of understanding in interactions between native-speaking social workers and non-native speaking clients is an example of this alternative approach to gatekeeping encounters. He is less interested in illuminating and explaining misunderstandings on the basis of cultural, ethnic and other group memberships and more focused on describing strategies of understanding and constructions of meaning between native speakers and non-native speakers (See Sundberg 2004; Fogtman 2007). Although Svennevig in this study orients to, and to some extent focuses on the group membership of the participants and aspects such as asymmetry and processes of exclusion (Svennevig 2005:52), this focus is much less pronounced and instead he displays a general interest in strategies for the interactional co-construction of meaning. In this sense Svennevig’s study is in line with other Conversation Analytical studies of interactions involving non-native, lingua franca, or foreign language speakers (See Gardner & Wagner 2004; Mondada 2004). Such studies seek to avoid the categorisation and labelling of the participants’ cultural, ethnic, social, or linguistic group membership and focus on describing how understanding, meaning is achieved. Rather than trying to answer the question of how linguistic and cultural difference influences interactions, they explore for example how the normality and abnormality of language practices is produced (Firth 1996), how ‘being a plurilingual speaker’ (Mondada 2004) is achieved, how ‘second-language talk’ can be interactionally characterised and compared with ordinary talk (Gardner & Wagner 2004) and how ‘proficiency’ is interactionally co-constructed (Brown 2003).

This approach to interactions between participants with different language or cultural backgrounds, including the gatekeeping encounters, offers a way of describing the relation

between interactional and linguistic behaviour and a broader cultural context in an ethnomethodological sense without allowing the analytical gaze to be clouded by preconceptions of pre-established assumptions about the influence of this context or the group membership of the participants. The ordinariness of a lot of the actions and orientations of non-native speakers or ethnic minority candidates and the influence of general contextual factors rather specific cultural factors are allowed a greater deal of emphasis. The problem with most CA studies of interactions with non-native speakers is that they marginalize the issue of how social categories and the establishment of such categories intertwine with the actions, behaviours and interpretations of the participants. In the case of gatekeeping encounters as defined by Erickson and Schultz, that is interactions where one person has the authority to make decisions that affect another person, this marginalization implies that all they see is meaning and not how certain meanings produce and maintain processes of exclusion and inclusion.

While the contribution of CA to the study of gatekeeping encounters is the emphasis on and acknowledgement of what is actually achieved and occurring in the local context of the interaction, which involves a temporary bracketing of the membership and identities of the participants, the full potential of this approach is to be explored by illuminating the way that categorisation practices tie in with broader structures of meaning and produce processes of exclusion and inclusion. Consequently, the present approach to gatekeeping seeks to combine the insights generated by classical gatekeeping studies about processes of exclusion and inclusion related to structures of meaning and ideology with the interactional approach to social, cultural and linguistic membership categories as interactionally produced. The following and final section in this chapter will unfold this alternative approach to gatekeeping as an interactional process of categorisation related to practices of decision-making and evaluation which are embedded in ideological processes and structures of meaning.

2.3.5 Gatekeeping as an Interactional and Ideological Process

The studies of gatekeeping are important because they bring attention to the way processes of exclusion and selection are in effect in some interactions on both a more explicit and a more implicit level. On a very explicit and overall level, some interactions involve gatekeeping simply because their purpose and goal is the assessment and selection of some participant by another participant. This is, as described in the previous sections, the case with the internship interviews. On a more implicit level, this decision-making and assessment in some cases

systematically favours some at the expense of others on the basis of social identity or group membership and the actions and behaviour associated with this group membership. These are the more subtle processes of inclusion and exclusion influencing decision-making practices and encounters which have been explained in terms of communicative style, inferential processes, discourse mismatches, misunderstandings and social identity within various studies of gatekeeping. These studies consider gatekeeping to be the outcome of the actions and behaviours of participants in interactions as well as their interpretations and inferences in relation to such actions and behaviour. In this thesis gatekeeping is viewed as an interactional phenomenon in itself, which can perhaps not be explained but described through the orientations, actions and behaviour of the participants in interaction. This conception of gatekeeping will be described and defined in this section.

What is highlighted by the many studies of gatekeeping is that the participants, through their actions and behaviour, establish and orient towards various social identities, or membership categories, and this orientation informs the assessment and decision-making practices taking place. However, the gatekeeping studies presented above all focus primarily on how specific communicative styles contribute to the establishment of and inferences about the social identity of the interviewees and how this influences the decision-making. As described previously, differences in behaviour between the interviewee and the interviewer are considered influential and problematic in processes of interpretation and inference. Interactional analysis is applied to illuminate problems and mismatches and ethnographic interviews are used to illuminate the participants' inferences, understandings and interpretations of these.

While the results generated by such studies are persuasive and important, they focus primarily on the issue of communicative style and how it can be related to specific social, linguistic or cultural category memberships that are selected as relevant by the employer. What is missing in this perspective, are the many other social identities, or membership categories, made relevant by the participants not only by their communicative style but by their actions and behaviour in general as they establish and achieve the activities, purposes and participation framework of the speech situation. While membership categorisation and the orientation towards some categories rather than others can certainly be said to be influenced by specific features of the context and the behaviour of the participants, such as communicative style and bodily traits, specific aspects of this behaviour and context should not be assumed to

exclusively determine processes of categorisation and decision-making. As will be shown in the analysis in chapter 5, the decision-making and assessment practices within the internship interview involves the orientation towards other social categories that are not related to language or can be said to be made relevant exclusively by specific language behaviour. As will be illustrated, social categories related to nationality, language and religion are made relevant by the participants in relation to the negotiation of the future internship and the tasks, competences and situations this will involve and these processes of argumentation and categorisation are influenced by ideology and structures of meaning.

The perspective on gatekeeping offered in this thesis does not focus on communicative style to the same extent as other studies of gatekeeping, although language behaviour and ideologies of language are acknowledged and mentioned as an important dimension of it (see section 5.4). Instead, attention will be focused on how decision-making practices and the negotiations about the future internship tie in with, and are influenced by, processes of categorisation in general.

In this thesis, gatekeeping will be defined and approached in a way that is related to but different from other approaches to gatekeeping, namely as an interactional phenomena linked to processes of categorisation. This does not imply that all categorisation processes are gatekeeping processes, since the notion of gatekeeping accentuates the establishment and effects of relations of power. While categorisation processes do not necessarily produce or reflect relations of power, some categorisation practices reflect and establish a system of relations between categories and the members of such categories that involves an uneven distribution of rights, knowledge and status.

Gatekeeping is thus considered to be *processes of categorisation that involve the establishment of a specific system of relations between categories and the systematic uneven attribution, by the participants, of rights, knowledge and status between the members of different categories*. While the effect of gatekeeping processes might be larger in encounters where they are related to the decision-making of one person that affects the future of another, they are not limited to such encounters. In other words, gatekeeping is not a bureaucratic or institutional phenomenon as such, but rather a general interactional and discursive phenomenon of categorisation, category association and dissociation, which produces and manifests social relations of power between the participants and which in decision-making encounters can be consequential for the person evaluated and interviewed.

As highlighted by the many different studies of gatekeeping, negotiations of social categories and category membership are informed and enabled by interpretative frameworks or the interpretative resources supplied by the common sense of a given time and place. However, as I have argued, specific interpretative frameworks cannot necessarily be assumed to belong to and be constituted by specific social, national or linguistic groups and determine the behaviour and interpretations of its members. Specific interpretative frameworks or repertoires are made relevant and applied by the participants in relation to specific actions and categorisation practices. The interpretative processes involved in decision-making and assessment may be illuminated through an analysis of the patterns of assumptions that are formulated as part of decision-making, assessment and the various membership categorisations involved rather than through interviews with the participants before and after the decision and assessment have been made.

Processes of gatekeeping may be studied as categorisation processes that produce social categories and social relations of power, but are simultaneously informed by common sense assumptions and repertoires about social categories and their organisation in relation to each other. Categorisation involves the production, negotiation and reproduction of social categories and social organisation and this process is constitutive of and informed by patterns of assumptions and interpretative repertoires which reveal the embedding of local interactions in broader structures of ideology and common sense. This relation between categorisation, common sense, ideology and interpretative repertoires will be described in the following chapter.

Chapter 3

Categories in Interaction – An Interactional Approach to the Knowledge and Social Organization of Individuals

The terms and forms by which we achieve understanding of the world and ourselves are social artefacts, products of historically and culturally situated interchanges among people. (Gergen 1994:49)

This chapter presents a discursive psychological and ethnomethodological conceptualization of social categories as properties of socially generated and accumulated knowledge. This understanding challenges certain sociological (Miles 1989) and psychological (Festinger 1954; Tajfel 1981; Turner & Giles 1981) approaches to inter-group relations and conflict that consider social groups and social identities respectively as properties of a macro-sociological or cognitive landscapes, constituted by economical or psychological dynamics (Wetherell & Potter 1992:72-79). Such approaches insert a departmentalising division between the social and the individual realm and produce static and rigid conceptualizations of individual being and social life in which the individual is a slave of either cognitive functions or social and economic dynamics. As such they have been the object of criticism of ethnomethodologists (Garfinkel 1967; Sacks 1972b; Heritage 1984b; Sacks 1992b; Sacks 1992a) and social psychologists (Potter & Wetherell 1987; Wetherell & Potter 1992), who in different ways and to different ends have advocated conceptualizations of social groups as products of social interaction and processes of meaning.

What will be presented here is a notion of social categories as products of the processes of meaning in which social reality is constructed and organized and a perspective on knowledge, thought and action as communal constructs rather than individual properties. This conception is informed by ethnomethodological and discursive psychological ideas about categories and more generally inspired by social constructionist notions of reality as socially constituted (Shotter & Gergen 1989; Gergen 1991; Gergen 1994; Gergen 2001).

Thus, this chapter presents the theoretical background for the analytical and methodological perspective explored in chapter 5, which combines Conversation Analysis of *Membership Categorization Devices* with Discursive Psychological analysis of *interpretative repertoires*. The former accentuates the ‘in situ’ negotiations of meaning and social

organization and the latter highlights the broader structures of meaning that such negotiations are embedded in and influenced by.

Conversation Analysis and Discursive Psychology have various theoretical and methodological overlaps and one might argue that either of the two alone could be used to illuminate local as well as broader structures of meaning. However, certain differences in their theoretical and methodological foundations result in different analytical ambitions and interests and thereby different conceptual strengths, which makes the application and combination of the two perspectives fruitful. In order to illuminate the potential of their combination, the following presentation focuses on the individual contributions and differences of Conversation Analysis and Discursive Psychology.

3.1 Discursive Psychology

The sub-discipline of Discursive Psychology (DP) (Hepburn & Wiggins 2005; Potter 2005) was established through a theoretical and ontological opposition made by theorists such as Jonathan Potter, Margaret Wetherell, Kenneth Gergen, John Shotter, Derek Edwards, Charles Antaki and Michael Billig to central notions and conceptualizations within cognitive and social psychology. These theorists in different ways contended the hegemony of ‘individual minds’ as the locus of explanation for ‘psychological’ constructs such as identity, emotions, attitudes and personality and for social issues such as racism, gender and inter-group relations. Such constructs and issues had previously been studied in relation to cognition, psychodynamics and inter-group dynamics. They argued that the traditional psychological objects of study, through structures of discourse and power, has gained an ontological status as phenomena that are separated from and determining of individual practice. DP seeks to redefine these phenomena within an interactional and social framework and advocates for understanding such ‘individual’ phenomena as products of social relations and interactions. Social categories are hereby linked to processes of language, discourse and ideology rather than cognitive processes and group dynamics.

The importance of the development of DP is that identity, emotions, cognition, self, attitudes, racism as well as various social categories related to gender, ethnicity and sexuality are now to an increasing extent being studied as phenomena, which are produced and reproduced in social interactions and relations. Rather than being considered linked to mental, psychological and cognitive functions and characteristics, they are considered in relation to the mutual negotiations and orientations of interlocutors in interaction. DP has, in other words,

moved the object of study from the psychic, cognitive realm to the social and discursive realm, which highlights the historical, linguistic, cultural and social context rather than the cognitive, psychodynamic and developmental context as the locus of individual as well as social processes of meaning.

Although cognition and psychodynamics are still valid and active fields of research, DP has drawn attention to the fact that some of the phenomena that were previously considered primarily cognitive or psychodynamic have important social dimensions as well and may, to some extent, be reformulated as primarily social. This has changed the distribution of labour within psychology and opened new research possibilities. This means that DP focuses on variation, polysemy and construction in its approach to social categories such as gender, ethnicity, culture and race, and highlights the importance of context.¹⁶ The discursive and cultural context is considered to be dynamic and constantly re-constructed and negotiated through interaction.

This 'discursive turn' within psychology was heavily inspired by the spread of social constructionist ideas (Shotter & Gergen 1989; Gergen 1991; Gergen 1994) and poststructuralist thinking¹⁷ (Potter & Wetherell 1987; Wetherell 1998). Other influences fuelling the discursive turn include the discipline of rhetoric (Billig 1991; Billig 1996), Wittgenstein's ideas on language as action, Austin's speech act theory and not least the development of ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis within Sociology (Potter & Wetherell 1987).

The influence from ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis has recently become more pronounced much due to the work of theorists such as Charles Antaki (Antaki & Widdicombe 1998a), Jonathan Potter, Robin Wooffitt and Derek Edwards (Edwards & Potter 1992; Edwards 1997). This has not only steered DP in a certain direction methodologically but has opened up widespread discussions about how interactional data can and should be analysed, since there are obvious differences in the theoretical and methodological roots of DP and CA.

Briefly put, one might say that while Conversation Analysis is primarily interested in the organization of talk-in-interaction, Discursive Psychology concentrates on how different versions of the social world are constructed and negotiated in interaction and how these

¹⁶ For further introduction to Discursive Psychology see Edwards and Potter, 1992; Potter, 2005 ; Potter and Wetherell, 1987; Wetherell and Potter, 1988; Wetherell and Potter, 1992 ; Wooffitt, 2005

¹⁷ See section 4.5 for an elaboration of the perspective on language presented in this thesis.

constructions and meanings are related to power, ideology and social organization on a broader discursive and social level. Furthermore, there are differences with respect to the phenomena studied within CA and DP. Where CA tends to focus on specific interactional phenomena such as reciprocity, turn-taking, pre-faces and so on, DP often focuses on phenomena that are typically considered social, discursive or psychological and describe these as interactional accomplishments. These differences and the question of whether and how they can be combined will be elaborated in section 3.3 and will be clearer as the sociological discipline of Ethnomethodology and the sub-discipline of CA are unfolded in the following section. First, however, it is necessary to describe and examine one of the central concepts within DP, *interpretative repertoires*, which is a concept used by Margaret Wetherell and Jonathan Potter to illuminate the broader structures of meaning that contextualize and inform the micro-dynamics of interactional negotiation. The notion of *interpretative repertoires* in this way represents the difference in analytical orientation and interest of DP and CA, which will be explored further in the remainder of the chapter.

3.1.1 Interpretative repertoires

The term *repertoire* highlights the way that a specific collection of words, utterances and formulations are available as resources for the members of a given community. It first appears in the work of sociolinguists John Gumperz and Dell Hymes who use the term *linguistic repertoire* to explain the use of specific linguistic variables by members of a speech community. The idea that a certain collection of discursive resources is available to and shared by the members of a given community and can be used in the explanation of people's language use is also central to the notion of *interpretative repertoires*. Following this idea the exploration of patterns in language use can reveal repertoires that provide a discursive point of entry to the study of culture, if culture is defined as communities of meaning. This will be elaborated in chapter 4. Here the notion of interpretative repertoire will be described as it is defined and used within DP, namely as an analytical unit that can be used to highlight the interpretative resources available within a particular discursive context and are used by interlocutors to construct meaning in interaction.

Within DP the notion of interpretative repertoire has been used and defined by Jonathan Potter and Margaret Wetherell as “...*relatively internally consistent, bounded language units...*” (Wetherell & Potter 1988:172), which is inspired by Gilbert and Mulkay's study from 1984 of empiricist repertoires used by scientist as a means of representing their results as

factual and objective. Repertoires are in this way defined as something that can be identified in language use and described as a unit. As is clear from the following definition, such units are however not straightforwardly and absolutely definable, since they constitute the sum of a range of different discursive tools such as tropes, imagery, words, expressions and so on. As Wetherell and Potter describe, they are in this sense ‘summary units’ that describe patterns of discourse and they are the ‘building blocks’ for establishing meaning in a particular way:

In dealing with lay explanations the analyst often wishes to describe the explanatory resources to which speakers have access and to make interpretations about patterns in the content of the material. The interpretative repertoire is a summary unit at this level. Repertoires can be seen as the building blocks speakers use for constructing versions of actions, cognitive processes and other phenomena. Any particular repertoire is constituted out of a restricted range of terms used in a specific stylistic and grammatical fashion. Commonly these terms are derived from one or more key metaphors and the presence of a repertoire will often be signalled by certain tropes or figures of speech (Wetherell & Potter 1988:172).

In other words, interpretative repertoires are discursive registers of expressions, images, ways of speaking and concepts that the individual uses to construct versions of him/her-self and reality (Potter & Wetherell 1987; Wetherell & Potter 1992). The identification of interpretative repertoires in this way involves the identification of patterns in one’s ways of speaking, the use of particular expressions, words and formulaic phrases. Such patterns can be manifested at the level of content as well as the level of form, although the distinction between the two is hardly tenable. In relation to a description of the ‘empiricist repertoire’ identified in the study by Gilbert and Mulkay, Potter highlights the form-dimension of repertoires primarily:

Discourse of this kind treats data as primary and provides only generalized, inexplicit formulations of the actions and beliefs of the scientist. When the scientist does appear he or she is depicted as forced to undertake actions by the demands of natural phenomena or the constraints of rules (Potter 1996:116).

The ‘empiricist repertoire’ is here found manifested in the formatting of the descriptions of the actions and the beliefs of the scientist which works to deemphasize the agency of the scientist.

While Potter highlights the form-dimension of interpretative repertoires in relation to the study by Gilbert and Mulkay it is the content dimension which is emphasized in Wetherell and Potter’s own study of racist discourse in New Zealand, where they describe patterns in words and expressions rather than patterns in formatting and grammatical form. As Wetherell and Potter describe:

Interpretative repertoires are pre-eminently a way of understanding the *content* of discourse and how that content is organized. Although stylistic and grammatical elements are sometimes closely associated with this organization, our analytic focus is not a linguistic one; it is concerned with language use, what is achieved by that use and the nature of the interpretative resources that allow that achievement (Wetherell & Potter 1992:90-91; *Italics in original*).

Interpretative repertoires are intimately linked with rhetoric and the argumentation for a specific opinion, position or version of reality in relation to a particular interactional context. Interpretative repertoires are used as part of the establishment and solidification of something as factual and ‘real’ and to define reality in a specific way and as Potter argues “...*one of the features of any description is that it counters – actually or potentially – a range of competing alternative descriptions*” (Potter 1996:106). Thus, they are an integral part of any negotiation over meaning and not least processes of categorization and they illuminate broader social controversies and dilemmas of *common sense* (see section 3.1.2, 3.3.2, and 4.5.7).

The problem with interpretative repertoires is that, given the variation and complexity of their manifestation, they are not easily pinned down and illustrated, nor are they easily exemplified as part of a theoretical description such as this. For this reason I will present a more concrete and elaborate description of interpretative repertoires in the actual analysis in chapter 5. However, to give a rough idea of what might be said to constitute an interpretative repertoire, the recent debate about the Danish cartoons depicting the religious prophet Mohammad provides an illustrative, although grossly simplified example. In this debate, two opposing positions may be identified; one in favour of the cartoons in the name of freedom of speech and another against the cartoons in the name of cultural and religious sensitivity. The arguments for these two positions would quite systematically evoke different interpretative repertoires regarding the Muslim population. While where the former would emphasize the problem of religious radicalism and fundamentalism that the cartoons were addressing by using imagery such as burning flags, guns, jihad and so on, the other would highlight the democratic, modern and moderate Muslims victimized by the cartoons by showing representatives of the Muslim community speaking publicly and eloquently against the printing of the cartoons or participating in official and orderly demonstrations.

While this example does not permit a more precise illumination of the patterns in wording, formulations, imagery etc. that reveal such repertoires, it illustrates the idea of how different clusters of meaning in relation to a specific issue or aspect of the social reality can be evoked to represent this reality as factual in a specific way. It furthermore illustrates how

specific words, expressions and imagery can be put together quite easily to produce meanings that are recognizable to an audience.

Similar to the notion of linguistic repertoires, interpretative repertoires constitute what is acceptable and recognizable within a given context and thus form a way to analyze what is considered culturally shared and familiar (see chapter 4). As Wetherell states:

The term interpretative repertoire is an attempt to capture the ‘doxic’ (Barthes, 1977) nature of discourse. An interpretative repertoire is a culturally familiar and habitual line of argument comprised of recognizable themes, common places and tropes (doxa)... These interpretative repertoires comprise members’ methods for making sense in this context – they are the common sense which organizes accountability and serves as a back-cloth for the realization of locally managed positions in actual interaction... (Wetherell 1998:400-401)

The notion of interpretative repertoires is in other words an attempt to establish a link between the activities and actions of individuals in interaction and broader structures of meaning or discourses that provide the resources for such activities and actions and define a range of possibilities for our understanding and formulation of reality (Foucault 1978; Foucault 1980). Such discourses are not only manifested in our language and our interpretations, but also influence and determine our economic, political and societal organization (Foucault 1977). But most importantly discourses offer specific clusters of meaning, that is, interpretative repertoires, which are the foundation of the moment-to-moment negotiation of meaning in interaction. The difference between interpretative repertoires and discourses is, in other words, that repertoires are flexible and used for local, interactional purposes whereas discourses have more of a monolithic quality to them. Different repertoires are used as resources for specific interactional purposes (Potter 1996:131; Wooffitt 2005:154) and they can in this way be used as a tool for a bottom-up rather than a top-down form of analysis.

In describing the combination of a conversation analytical and post-structuralist perspective Potter uses the image of building construction, where discourses are the prefabricated walls that are held together by the bolts and cement provided by procedures and devices described by conversation analysts (Potter 1996:103). Pushing this image further, interpretative repertoires can be said to be the specific ways in which different buildings are constructed with particular functions, forms and content. They can be described as units or structures that are established in the actions, utterances and words of interlocutors, influenced by pre-fabricated structures of meaning. I do not mean to suggest that the structures of

meaning or repertoires used in interaction are fixed and inflexible entities that can be imported and used in the same way in different contexts. Interpretative repertoires are resources as well as products in the sense that the context, action and function of their application realize a specific manifestation. Or in Potter's words: "*Everything exists in a fuzzy and fluid state until crystallized in particular texts or particular interactions.*" (Potter 1996)

3.1.2 Processes of categorization

What is highlighted by the discursive psychological perspective and the notion of interpretative repertoires is how social categories, groups and identities are constituted in interaction in various ways for various purposes using various discursive and interactional resources. An important contribution to the formulation of this process of constitution is the work of rhetorical psychologist Michael Billig, whose perspectives on processes of categorization link the arguing and thinking of individuals with structures of *common sense* and ideology.

Billig's theoretical foundation is ancient rhetoric combined with Gramscian notions of ideology (see sections 3.3.2. and 4.5.7), which makes his approach to categorization more abstracted from actual interactional practice and a basis for controversy with a conversation analytical position¹⁸. However, his ideas of categorization as part of the processes of argumentation and thinking are in many respects compatible with, and also inspired by, ethnomethodological or conversation analytical ideas.

Billig describes categorization as a fundamental part of an argumentative or deliberative process and hereby implicitly links categorization to an interactional context in which meanings of words, actions and social categories are established and first and foremost negotiated between interactants. Billig's main endeavour is, like the other discursive psychologists, to dissolve the distinction between a cognitive and a social domain, and he does this by describing the process of thinking as intimately linked with and influenced by processes of argumentation. Furthermore, he links the cognitive domain with an ideological domain by describing how all argumentation and thereby deliberation is embedded in, and influenced by, a cultural context of *common sense* and ideology, which is fundamentally heterogeneous and contradictory.

¹⁸ Billig has been involved in fierce disputes with Emmanuel Schegloff over the issue of context and interpretative process involved in the analysis of interactions. See (Schegloff 1997; Schegloff 1998; Billig 1999a; Billig 1999b; Schegloff 1999)

Billig challenges the widespread conceptualization within cognitive psychology of categorization as a necessary means of creating orderliness and meaning and argues that categorization is neither more nor less necessary than the opposite process of particularisation. Consequently, he opens up the possibility of a more positive and less deterministic perspective on human life. Categorization should, in other words, not be considered in relation to cognitive limitations, but rather in relation to context specific argumentation and negotiation of meaning. Despite the fact that Billig has a different methodological approach than Conversation analysis, he agrees with its methodological proposition that the process of meaning should be situated in a social and interactional context rather than in cognitive processes. His emphasis on categorization as an integral part of processes of meaning and social organization resonates with the ethnomethodological focus on interaction as the locus of social constitution and organization. This perspective will be described in the following.

3.2 Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis

Ethnomethodology (EM) is a strand within sociology, which was established and developed by Harold Garfinkel and Harvey Sacks during the 1950'ies and 1960'ies. The subject of ethnomethodological inquiry was, and is, the social order and the means by which participants establish and orient to it in interaction (Hester & Eglin 1997a). The participant perspective is thus central to ethnomethodological enquiry and the ambition is to describe the knowledge and procedures that ordinary people use to make sense of, and organize, the actions and activities that they engage in. As formulated by John Heritage:

The term 'ethnomethodology' thus refers to the study of a particular subject matter: the body of common-sense knowledge and the range of procedures and considerations by means of which the ordinary members of society make sense of, find their way about in, and act on the circumstances in which they find themselves. (Heritage 1984b:4)

The influence of Harvey Sacks' lectures on conversation as well as the work of sociologists Emmanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson resulted in the formation and development within the last thirty years of the sub-discipline Conversation Analysis (CA) that focuses on the structuring of social action as it is manifested and achieved in talk-in-interaction in ordinary conversations. CA is, like EM in general, concerned with the competences and knowledge of individuals and the way in which they inform and enable social action (Heritage 1984b:241).

One of the distinctive tenets of CA was the commitment to describing social action without recourse to the idealizing use of social scientific concepts that blur the characteristics of the events they seek to describe. Hence, Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson and their followers sought to develop a method of analysis that would enable a close description of conversational events that would allow accumulation and avoid glossing generalizations (Heritage 1984b:234).

Another strand of research within EM and CA, also initiated by Sacks, is *Membership Categorization Analysis* (MCA), which is concerned with how people use and orient to social categories as they participate in the accomplishment of ordinary activities and social structure (Hester & Eglin 1997b:3). This dimension of CA is specifically relevant to the perspective on social categories advocated in this thesis and it will be explored further in section 3.2.3.

EM and CA are data-driven forms of analysis (Heritage 1984b; Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998; Nielsen & Nielsen 2005), which means that the analytical process begins by listening to and looking at action or talk-in-interaction and reconstructing the participants' orientations towards the local construction of meaning and the social order. This process is followed by the building of a corpus of specific interactional phenomena, which is finally described both through examples of the phenomena as such and through examples of deviant cases of the phenomena in which the participants show their orientation towards normativity by their treatment of deviances from this normativity.

This process has inspired and influenced the methodology of discursive psychology as described by Jonathan Potter and Margaret Wetherell (Potter & Wetherell 1987; Wetherell & Potter 1988). They explain how the identification of interpretative repertoires involves finding several examples of the repertoires as such and documenting the systematicity of their appearance as well as finding examples in which different, incommensurable repertoires appear and documenting that they are treated as such. CA and DP share the methodology of documenting participants' orientations towards structure and regularity in discourse through descriptions of patterns of behaviour and discourse and responses to deviations from such patterns.

3.2.1 Indexicality

One of the central premises of EM and CA is that of *indexicality* which basically describes the fundamentally local nature of meaning-making both in relation to content and action. The sense of certain actions, words and categories is never decontextualised but situated and

contextually embedded (Hester & Eglin 1997a:11). This notion of meaning opposes traditional sociological notions of individual actions as determined by overall sociological structures and categories. CA sees local actions as determining what those structures are rather than being products or results of their existence.

The principle of indexicality is however not only a theoretical premise but an analytical starting point, in the sense that what is being studied within EM and CA is exactly the local establishment of meaning and social order. Sacks' point was that the meaning of categories such as young, immigrant etc. change their meaning in relation to the context in which they are used, in the same way as indexicals such as I, you, here, there, do. The meaning and use of categories must therefore be seen in relation to the local context of an interaction. Sacks has, however, been criticised for reifying these categories and treating them in a de-contextualised way in his famous article *On the Analyzability of Stories by Children* from 1972.

Hester & Eglin argue that "*It has to be decided in each and every case what the category means and this will involve a figuring out of what collection the category belongs to, for this occasion.*" (Hester & Eglin 1997b:18) While it can be said that some of the formulations in this article seem to be referring to the meaning of categories such as 'baby' and actions such as 'crying' as if they are absolute and can be abstracted from local situated practices, this criticism is refuted by Schegloff (2007) as a misreading of Sacks. Schegloff argues that the problem with this article is rather a problem of methodology, since Sacks is basing his article on a de-contextualized example of an interaction taken from a children's story and that this prevents Sacks from including in the analysis the way the participants orient to and establish the meaning of 'baby' or 'crying'.

3.2.2 Sequentiality

Another central premise of EM and CA is the principle of *sequentiality*, which describes the idea that the significance of actions and utterances are doubly contextual in the sense that they are at once shaped by what precedes them and giving shape to what follows. As Heritage states, a speaker's action is at once context-shaped and context-renewing (Heritage 1984b:242). This principle is fundamental to the orderliness established by participants in interaction and which is the object of study for conversation analysts. Furthermore, it is closely related to another emphasis in CA, namely that of *paired action-sequences*, which involves the study of how the significance of any given action is demonstrated in the responses to such action by a subsequent action. As Heritage puts it:

Conversation analysis is therefore primarily concerned with the ways in which utterances accomplish particular actions by virtue of their placement and participation within sequences of actions. It is sequences and turns-within-sequences which are thus the primary units of analysis. (Heritage 1984b:245)

The principle of *sequentiality* is part of our communicative knowledge and competences as social individuals and it is normative in the sense that a given action establishes certain expectations about what following actions would be relevant. This is referred to as the *sequential implicativeness* of a turn's talk by Schegloff and Sacks (Schegloff & Sacks 1973:296). Some actions are conventionally paired with other actions, for example greetings that are followed by replies or questions that are followed by answers. Sacks established an analytical framework to describe such ritualized action-pairs, which he called *adjacency pairs*. As Heritage describes (Heritage 1984b:247), the point of *adjacency pairs* was not to suggest that the first part of an *adjacency pair* would always be followed by the second part, but rather that the mere formulation of a first part establishes the expectation of a second part and makes the participants accountable for delivering this. This was formulated by Schegloff as the principle of *conditional relevance* (Schegloff 1968). People will in this way orient to and reveal what is expected even when such expectations are not met.

The principle of *sequentiality* is not only manifested in the expectations established by certain actions and in the projection of particular actions by other actions, but in the very systematic of *turn-taking*, that structures and organizes the interchanging distribution of turns of talk between the participants in a given interaction. This systematic was specifically formulated as a organized system by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, in a classic paper called *A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking in Conversation* (Sacks et al. 1974). It describes the various ways in which a speaker can appoint or be appointed next speaker, i.e. ways in which a speaker can take or be given 'the floor'. There are, in brief, the following options: A speaker can appoint the next speaker, which dictates that this person takes the turn right away; a speaker can self-select himself/herself as next speaker, if there are no other speakers appointed; and finally a speaker can continue speaking if no other participant has made use of the other rules. This system is circular and can continue endlessly.

One turn-at-talk can consist of one single word or several sentences, but it often consists of various units that are called *Turn Construction Units* (TCU's.) These *TCU's* create places where it is possible that the speaker will finish speaking or that another speaker will begin speaking, since the turn is potentially finished at that point. These places are called *Possible*

Completion Points (PCP's). Talk often continues over several PCP's, as participants may continually negotiate whether a turn is finished or not. Neither speakers nor hearers know whether a person speaking will continue speaking or whether a hearer will begin speaking regardless of whether or not the first speaker was finished. In some cases though, these PCP's are actually used by either speaker or hearer as a point of turn transition and when this happens they are referred to as *Transition Relevant Places* (TRP's) (Psathas 1995; Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998; Steensig 2001; Nielsen & Nielsen 2005).

The turn-taking model created by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson thus explains the principle of people talking one after the other and it is based on the assumption that all participants have an equal distribution of rights to talk. It should be noted that this model is based on ordinary interactions that are considered to be equal and symmetric and not institutional interactions such as the internship interview, where the turn-taking system and the distribution of rights between the participants may have a different realization. While the notion of ordinary conversations as symmetric and equal is problematic and may certainly be disputed (see section 2.2.4), the systematics of turn-taking as an underlying principle of interaction and a fundamental premise for the principles of *sequentiality* and *indexicality* represents a valuable contribution to the study of social categories, since it illuminates the micro-dynamics of the processes of meaning and social organization in which such categories are constituted.

3.2.3 Membership Categorization Devices

The work of Harvey Sacks has opened up two different, though closely related, strands of work within CA. One focuses on the sequential organization of interaction and the other focuses on the organization of various membership categories into *Membership Categorization Devices* (MCD'S). Sacks showed (Sacks 1972b; Sacks 1972a) how individuals in interaction constantly ordered and re-ordered objects and categories into various collections or the so-called Membership Categorization Devices. Membership Categorization Devices are, however, not merely collections of categories, but refer to the entire 'apparatus' of categorization, i.e. the collections of categories plus the rules of their application. As Schegloff states:

...we are looking for an account for the sorts of hearings and understandings such usages get, and for the practices that get them produced in a fashion that achieves these understandings (Schegloff 2007:467).

Associating a range of objects, persons or phenomena into a certain category in this way means simultaneously ascribing a range of characteristics, traits or descriptors to the objects within the category. This means, that people/objects ascribed to a specific category are simultaneously ascribed with certain features. It also means that people/objects having specific features, which includes specific actions or behaviour, can be ascribed to a certain category. A person can thus be ascribed to, or self-apply, different categories and do so in various ways for various purposes, but the instant a different category is evoked different features, actions and characteristics of this person are highlighted and made relevant. Processes of membership categorization are in this way influenced by the principle of indexicality previously described. The category 'wife' for example has different category bound features than the category 'waitress' and even though each category can be used to describe a female individual, they contextualize an interaction in different ways and can be used to project two different topical developments of an interaction. By using the term Membership Categorization Devices, Sacks emphasizes that people use categories to various conversational and social ends.

People have various ways available to them of ascribing other people. However, while there are endless options of categorization, one category is in principle enough, which Sacks referred to as the '*economy rule*'. This is important, since it, as Schegloff describes, presents a starting point for making interpretations about categorizations in the sense that "*if one reference can be enough, why wasn't it?*" (Schegloff 2007:471). Additionally, as argued by Sacks (Sacks 1972b; Sacks 1972a; Schegloff 2007:467) any person can be ascribed according to at least two general characteristics, age and gender, which makes any choice of categorization subject to investigation, since there will always be at least one other possible choice of category. If people could only be categorized in one way, categorization would not be a practice that could tell us much else than it being a basic premise of communication. Since categorization always involves a choice between various categories, it is a practice that is not simply automatic, but is instead related to the situated action and context of a particular interaction and to the orientations of the participants involved.

Another rule introduced by Sacks, which influences the establishment and negotiation of categories, is the *consistency rule*. From this rule it follows that once a person is ascribed to a category which belongs to a specific MCD other persons can be ascribed to other categories within the same collection or device. In the internship interviews, for example, once the category of 'Iran' was introduced, other categories within the Membership Categorization

Device ‘Nationalities’ were made relevant and possible as resources of meaning. As Schegloff states: “...it does serve to inject into the scene or the activity the relevance of those other categories.” (Schegloff 2007:471)

A final notion related to MCA is *category-bound activities*. Certain actions are linked to specific categories through common-sense knowledge, like crying is linked to the category of babies. This means that through the mentioning of a specific kind of actions, certain categories can be invoked. In the same way, performing a certain action works to make a certain category relevant. Schegloff (Schegloff 2007) notes, however, that just as categories and Membership categorization devices are never simply relevant in or for an interaction, so the meaning of actions is always situated and negotiable. Crying, for example, is not merely a given phenomenon that automatically activates the category of baby, but is a situated practice which is given meaning as crying rather than for example an allergic reaction, a result of intense laughing etc. He argues that Sacks

...treats the description of the activity as non-problematic so as to focus on the categorization of the actors as problematic” and suggests instead that “the characterization of actions or activities is also a locus of order, and an apt candidate for analysis (Schegloff 2007:472)

Although it is emphasized by Sacks, Schegloff and other conversation analysts such as Hester & Eglin that the meanings of categories are to be considered locally situated and constructed, this is not always the case when studies are carried out in practice. Consider the following quote from Hester & Eglin’s study on interactions between educational psychologists and teachers, where the very categories, whose establishment and organisation they set out to investigate interactionally, are reified and treated as de-contextualized common sense knowledge:

The membership categories of the participants in the referral meetings are teacher and educational psychologist respectively. Together, they comprise the collection ‘parties to a referral meeting’ which is an example of a standardized relational pair of categories. These ‘parties to a referral meeting’ constitute the event or setting for what it recognizably is through their activity. The category predicates or category-bound activities of ‘teacher’ and ‘educational psychologist’ in this setting center around ‘problem talk’ (Hester & Eglin 1997c:28).

In this quote, the categories ‘teacher’ and ‘educational psychologist’ are inferred from the predefined setting of the interaction rather than the researchers unravelling and demonstrating the way the participants orient to, and co-construct these categories. This seems to go against

the principle of relevance (see section 3.3.1) and in fact their own description of the researcher's task at hand. Consider, as a final example of this, the following quote, which is taken from a part of the actual analysis. Here they describe the establishment of meaning around the category 'thief', but they do so by referring to the previously mentioned, seemingly pre-established other categories, which are referred to as 'contextual resources'.

The contextual resources used in making sense of this categorization include the category membership of the subject (referred pupil), the setting (referral meeting), the category membership of the participants (teacher and psychologist) and the immediate context of the co-selected descriptions...Furthermore, the occasioned device ('parties to a referral meeting'), its constituent categories (teacher and psychologist) and their category bound activities (talking about referral problems) all provide for the reasonable inference that the 'thieving' is not only petty but is a description of a problem for which the child has been referred to the psychologist and not to the police (Ibid.:29-30).

Here it is clear how some membership categories and category 'predicates', which is Hester & Eglin's term for *category-bound actions*, are used as a reference point or the inferential gravity for the meaning of other categories, here the category 'thief', rather than being studied as achieved and accomplished categories and actions in their own right.

In the previously mentioned *Membership Categorization Tutorial* paper Schegloff argues that Sacks' work is often mistakenly used for studies that refer to categories as decontextualised resources of common sense, and this could be argued to be an example of this. He emphasizes that this application of Sacks' work is based on a misunderstanding of his notion of membership categorizations as fundamentally constructed in situ. What Schegloff fails to recognize in his critique is, however, that any analysis of particular categories inevitably involves the reference to, and hereby the momentary fixation of, other categories, where membership categories referring to groups of people such as 'thieves' or other categories referring to other aspects of reality like for example categories of behaviour such as 'laughing', categories of things such as 'tools' or categories of emotions such as 'happy'. Analyzing the social construction of certain aspects of reality in this way involves a temporary reliance on the fixation of other aspects of reality.

3.3 Combining perspectives of DP and CA

There are many similarities in the way discursive psychologists and conversation analysts approach and perceive of social categories and processes of meaning because of the shared outset from the work of Harold Garfinkel and Harvey Sacks. This entails a common approach

to social categories as something that individuals produce, ascribe to, negotiate and challenge locally in social interaction. DP and CA share an interest in how language is used to categorize and arrange various phenomena and objects in various ways for various purposes, hereby making some categories and memberships more or less relevant. Having said this, there are differences in the way and the extent to which they interpret and follow the methodological and analytical prescriptions of Sacks. CA can be said to be the true disciple and follower of the work of Sacks, whereas Discursive Psychologists adapt some of Sack's ideas and use them in ways that can be said to depart from the original intention. In this chapter I will describe the CA position on the question of how to analyze membership categories and discuss some of the aspects that potentially conflict with a critical perspective such as DP.

The analytical tools applied within DP are to a large extent the same as those used within EM and CA but the analytical attention has been more focused on ...*how psychology and reality are produced, dealt with and made relevant by participants in and through interaction* (Hepburn & Wiggins 2005). While this slight difference in analytical focus of DP in relation to CA is first and foremost related to DP's aim of formulating an alternative to cognitive social psychology, it is also related to a more pronounced inspiration from poststructuralist and social constructionist ideas about the individual and the social as constituted through language processes. This influence is however more pronounced in the beginning of DP and seems to be less central in some of the more recent studies (Antaki 1994; Antaki & Wetherell 1999; Antaki et al. 2005; Hepburn & Wiggins 2005; Stokoe & Hepburn 2005; Stokoe & Edwards 2007).

Whereas the goal of discursive psychologists is generally speaking to describe the local negotiations of meaning and social organization within a broader discursive and ideological context, the end goal of conversation analysts is to illuminate social order as it is established at an interpersonal and interactional level. As previously described in relation to MCA, the aim of CA as formulated by its founders is the discovery of the apparatus that organizes not only membership categorization, but also the sequential organization of interaction. Hence, discursive psychologists use CA as part of an ideological and cultural critique, where conversation analysts refrain from taking this step and stick to the ambition of wanting to say something about the apparatus of talk-in-interaction and how it is realized in different contexts. In this respect some studies and perspectives within the field of CA may appear structuralist in the way they seek to describe the social order of the apparatus of talk-in-interaction as an isolated and self-regulating machinery. On the other hand one might argue that the abstraction

of discursive psychologists from the realm of interaction to the realm of discourse and ideology in the poststructuralist sense is equally structuralist in the way that they seek to explain specific interactional findings with reference to an overarching system of meaning and discourse that defines possibilities for action. Many discursive psychologists are surely more overtly driven by a critical agenda and therefore seem more interested in context in the broader sense. One might argue in engaging with the critical aspect of analysis, one simultaneously leaps into a more interpretative frame of analysis that not only seeks to describe but also to challenge the status quo.

The issue of critical versus non-critical forms of analysis has been discussed between discursive psychologists and conversation analysts throughout almost a decade, since it raises important methodological questions. In this thesis, I attempt to use the critical perspective offered by discursive psychology to suggest a relation between talk-in-interaction and broader social and discursive structures, but to infer this relation from a micro-analytic exploration of patterns of interaction across various internship interviews. The aim is to produce interactional research with a critical perspective by examining the establishment of certain membership categories in interaction and showing how they reveal a pattern that suggests particular and problematic structures of meaning insofar as they systematically produce an unequal distribution of rights, knowledge and status between the participants. This will be further illuminated and argued in chapter 5.

3.3.1 Critical analysis and ‘unmotivated’ looking

The methodological issue of whether analysis can or should be unmotivated or critically driven by a researcher’s interests is an object of controversy between some conversation analysts and those discursive psychologists that focus on questions related to power and ideology. This discussion involves the question of whether phenomena and categories should be included in an analysis if they are not made relevant and oriented to by the participants, but merely considered relevant by the analyst. This section will first present the discussion of critical analysis versus ‘unmotivated’ looking, then present a more specific discussion of the principles of relevance and procedural consequentiality, and finally return to a critical examination of the notion of ‘unmotivated looking’ which will lead to a presentation of the methodological positioning represented in this thesis.

As mentioned previously in this chapter, discursive psychological studies are often concerned with how actions and behaviour in interaction are related to broader structures of

discourse and power, whereas conversation analytical studies tend to limit their studies to a narrower context of talk-in-interaction. Well aware of the oversimplification that this distinction entails, an example of the former is discursive psychologist Susan Speers' study of how gender is constructed in various ways during psychiatric interviewing of transgender candidates for a sex change operation (Speer & Parsons 2006; Speer & Parsons 2007). An example of the latter is conversation analyst Lorenza Mondada's study of ways of 'doing being plurilingual' in international work meetings (Mondada 2004).

Although the fundamental premise within DP is that different social categories are made relevant in relation to various locally situated actions and activities, a focus on specific social categories, in Speers' case gender, is chosen, since the construction of this particular category has consequences for the future life of transgendered people. Finding out more about what constructions of gender either qualifies or disqualifies a person for specific future practices and privileges tells us something about the organization of common sense and the culturally salient distinctions of normality from abnormality. Such findings inform our understanding of what it means to be transgendered as well as normatively gendered.

Research such as Speer's study illuminates how meanings are contributing to the production or reproduction of unequal relations of power, processes of exclusion and inclusion and hierarchies of knowledge and power. Such power-related by-products of meaning are not necessarily oriented to as such by the interlocutors in an interactional exchange of utterances since they are not always visible to them, but may be concealed in a seemingly neutral exchange over various topics. This becomes particularly evident in native/non-native interactions, where the analyst shares a cultural and linguistic membership with the native speaker. In such cases the analysts may, due to his/her membership knowledge, pick up on some ideologically related categorizations that are not necessarily picked up by the non-native speaker, but is none the less influential to the overall interpretation of the interaction. Consider the following example:

Extract 30: Colombia

9
10 HO: Men jeg vil tro (.) sådn (.) uden at vide noget som
11 helst om Colombia så vil jeg tro at man i en børnehaveklasseforløb
12 her går (.) fra (.) en meget mere (.) >hvad skal man sige< (.)
13 regelstyret indgang i skolen til en meget mere hvad øh (.) a man
14 ka- ik- sige normstyret men [alligevel s
15
16 HO: But I would think (.) like (.) without knowing anything
17 about Colombia I would think that you in an pre-school class here
18 go (.) from (.) a much more (.) >what can you say< (.)
19 rulegoverned approach to school to a much more wha- eeh (.) ya-
20 you can't say valuegoverned [but still s
21
22 EM: [MEGET MEGET LÆRING >leg og læring< er
23 [A LOT A LOT OF LEARNING >play and
24
25 EM: blandet[sammen ik==
26 learning< is mixed [together right-
27
28 HO: [ja]
29 [yes]
30
31 HO: =ja=
32 =yes=
33
34 IN: =ja • (0.2) [ja meget meget (der)
35 =yes (0.2) [yes a lot a lot (there)
36
37 HO: [>hvør hvør< hvo:r hvør børnenes egen
38 [>where where< whe:re where the childrens own
39
40 HO: forvaltning (0.4) er ret stor fordi=
41 administration (0.4) is pretty big because=
42
43 IN: =ja:. (.) der er ligesom en introduktion til i skole faktis==
44 =ye:a. (.)there is sort of an introduction to in school actual==
45

In this extract there is no explicit orientation by the participants towards the categories ‘Danish’, ‘Native-Speaker’ or ‘Employer’, and yet this extract can be said to show a person, namely HO, ‘doing being’ not only native speaker, but also a member of the Danish majority and an employer managing an interview situation. First of all, HO is making a claim to knowledge about Colombia, which seems absurd considering the internship applicant to whom she is speaking is in fact Colombian¹⁹. Secondly, she is making this claim in a somewhat authoritative form, which is underlined by her insistence on continuing her characterization of Colombia after the internship candidate (IN) has tried to take the floor and respond to the claim. Third, her categorization of Colombia as less modern, authoritative and pedagogically antiquated in relation to Denmark places herself, being Danish, in a superior position in relation to IN, who is Colombian. IN is, however not orienting to HO as a majority culture member, a native speaker, or an employer. The analysis of membership categories of native speaker, Danish and employer, is made with reference to the contextual knowledge of the analyst, such as the fact that IN is Colombian and that HO knows this, that IN is Danish and that she is the employer.

¹⁹ This extract will be analysed in detail in chapter 5

This form of analysis would by some representatives of ‘core’ CA be considered problematic, since it uses pre-established knowledge about the participants to inform the analysis and furthermore associates the various categorizations with various power-relations. Although this would not necessarily be considered problematic within the field of CA often referred to as ‘applied’ CA, it is the voices of ‘core’ CA that are often heard in the debates on the issue of relevance and it is those voices that this section refers to.

Within CA the analytical outset is, as explained in section 3.2, data-driven, unmotivated looking and the ambition is to describe the interpretations, actions, categories and identities that are made relevant by the participants in their own right. Contextual knowledge about the context and the participants, whether related to nationality, ethnicity, gender, or otherwise should not be the point of departure, nor be included in an analysis unless such knowledge is oriented to by the interlocutors. CA focuses, as opposed to DP, only on the intersubjective and constructive process of negotiation in which the participants mutually orient to and create the conversational context and social order. Specific categories, whether related to nationality, gender or otherwise are, in other words, only included as analytical perspectives to the extent that they can be documented in the data. Conversation analysts are therefore critical of many forms of discourse analysis. The argument is that these critically motivated forms of analysis are imposing the researcher’s ideas and categories on the data, when the appropriate tactic would be to let the participant’s mutual responses and orientations decide what categories are relevant in the analysis.

Certain aspects of CA as it is presented by some of its representatives seem rather positivistic as defined by Kjørup, such as its reluctance towards critical analysis, its attempt to delimit and isolate the object of research, its aspirations towards quantifiable and reproducible data and its distinction of that which is ‘real’ from that which is ‘imagined’ or ‘speculative’ (Kjørup 1997:92). Without engaging in further discussions about positivism, the methodology of CA as formulated by Schegloff (re)produces a strict distinction between a formalized, precise and accurate analysis of reality and more ‘speculative’ forms of interpretive theorizing. Explanations are sought and found in empirical data only and any pre-established notions about the participants and the context is suspended from the analysis. As Antaki describes *...what you have is the discipline of holding off from saying that such and such a person is doing whatever it is he or she is doing because he or she is this or that supposed identity.* (Antaki & Widdicombe 1998b:5).

Although it is true that CA, as will be described in the following discussion, seeks to avoid any pre-established notions about its objects of research and attempts to describe interactions ‘in their own right’ from the perspective of the participants, this does not mean that CA as a whole does not acknowledge the necessity and influence of interpretation and inference as part of the analytic process. The very restrictive methodological position of CA presented in the following discussion of relevance should not be considered representative of CA as a whole, but should rather be understood as a methodological position established by Emmanuel Schegloff, Gail Jefferson and Harvey Sacks used by some conversation analysts as an analytical navigation point. There are in this way many respected conversation analysts that use the methodology of CA to produce critical, interpretative and theoretically guided forms of research and in no way subscribe to positivistic research ideals²⁰.

What is proposed in this thesis, is that the methodology of CA and not least its ethnomethodological foundation formulates a fundamentally interpretative endeavour that can very well be used to address specific questions and social issues and is highly compatible with more critical forms of analysis. However, as it will be proposed in relation to the issue of relevance, the principle of ‘holding off’ from giving explanations on the basis of assumed identities and categories and the commitment to the ‘documentation’ of the relevance of such identities and categories are important in ensuring the quality of such analysis.

While CA’s reasoning behind committing to such principles is primarily methodological, the reasons presented in this thesis are furthermore epistemological or even ontological in the sense that the social world is considered to be socially constructed and more specifically constituted through language. The methodological position expressed in this thesis by a reluctance to introduce or define categories such as woman, man, Muslim, employer or Danish is in this way strongly influenced by the surges of Social-constructionism, Poststructuralism and Deconstruction that have been flooding the field of Cultural Studies for decades. Ironically enough, these often abstracted and empirically detached ideas about identity and social categories such as gender and ethnicity as socially and discursively constituted resonate and combine well with the ethnomethodological and conversation analytic perspective. This is also argued and/or illustrated in the work of some British sociolinguists Ben Rampton and discursive psychologists Margaret Wetherell and Jonathan Potter (Wetherell & Potter 1988; Wetherell & Potter 1992; Wetherell 1998; Rampton 1999; Rampton 2003; Rampton 2005;

²⁰ See also (Rasmussen 1997; Kjærbeck 1998a; Kjærbeck 2005; Day 2008)

Wetherell 2005; Rampton 2006; Rampton et al. 2006). As will be clear from the following discussion of *relevance*, there are, however, major differences and disputes between the more critical and more ‘unmotivated’ approaches to interaction and in the following I will elaborate on these complexities and specify my own position and its implications.

Relevance and Procedural Consequentiality

In his 1997 paper *Whose text, whose context?* Schegloff describes the principle of *relevance* in the following way in relation to a critique of critical forms of discourse analysis that use contextual knowledge of the participants as a descriptive point of departure:

The reservation I wish to feature here is that such analyses make no room for the overtly displayed concerns of the participants themselves, the terms in which they relate to one another, the relevancies to which they show themselves to be oriented. Such analyses insist instead on characterizations of the parties, the relevancies, and the context, to which the *analyst* is oriented (Schegloff 1997:174).

As Schegloff notes in the same article, any person, action or context can be described in various ways that are all true, but that this is not sufficient to warrant a specific description. Since many different descriptions are true, one description cannot be truer than another. Schegloff (1997:170) has two main points: 1) Before relating cultural or interactional artefacts to a political, economic and cultural context, we must understand their constitution as objects in their own right . 2) For each inquiry we make, we have to establish and re-establish what constitutes the relevant social context.

What he is confronting with these two points are the forms of top-down analysis seen within the field of discourse analysis, where aspects of the contextual background are invoked to explain what goes on in an interaction rather than regarding this context as something which is constructed and negotiated from scratch in an interactional here and now. Although Schegloffs point is in many ways a valid critique of some forms of discourse analysis, he fails to recognize that although all interactions are to a certain extent *constructed* in situ, they are not *created* in the sense of there being nothing prior to their beginning. People use their knowledge of the speech situation, the other participants, the language used and a range of other semiotic resources available at the given time and place of the interaction to establish, produce, reproduce and organize meaning and social relations and furthermore – so does the analyst in recreating and reproducing the situation for academic purposes. Interactions are

never constructed ‘from scratch’ and the question is what can and should be considered the ‘objects under construction’ and what is to be assumed as ‘the resources for construction’.

With the notion of *procedural consequentiality* (Schegloff 1992:110-116; Schegloff 1994:196) Schegloff partially acknowledges that certain aspects of the context of an interaction influence the structure of the interaction and the orientations and actions of the participants. However, it does not offer an escape from, but rather a supplement to, the principle of relevance in the sense that it prescribes the analysis of how certain contextual factors, such as the setting or the institutionality of an interaction, are not only made relevant and oriented to by the participants, but are manifested in the procedural and systematic realization of the interaction. Schegloff formulates the question which the researcher should seek to answer in the following way:

How does the fact that the talk is being conducted in some setting (e.g. “the hospital”) issue in any consequence for the shape, form, trajectory, content, or character of the interaction that the parties conduct? (Schegloff 1992:111)

Schegloff’s principle of procedural consequentiality has contributed to broadening the field of research of CA to include institutional interactions different from the ‘ordinary conversations’ traditionally studied within CA. Such interactions are becoming more and more legitimate objects of study within CA, although they are explicitly distinguished from the primary and original objects of study by being associated with the field of ‘applied’ CA and by being labelled ‘institutional’. Schegloff’s principle of relevance and procedural consequentiality has not only contributed to defining and delimiting the object of research within CA, but has contributed to the development of a vast amount of studies of different manifestations of institutionality. These studies represent an extended degree of orientation towards the embedding of interactions within a particular context and seek to demonstrate the manifestation of this embedding in the structure and organization of the interaction.

The book *Talk at Work*, edited by Drew and Heritage (1992b), supports the argument that a characterisation of an interaction as institutional cannot be based on a priori or intuitive notions of certain identities, roles and tasks being performed in an institutional way, but rather on systematic documentation of the specific manifestation of institutionality. Drew and Heritage argue that such institutionality is manifested in the orientations to institutional tasks and functions as well as the restrictions on the contributions of actions and speech and the particular features of inference (Drew & Heritage 1992a:25).

The CA approach to context and the methodological restriction of the principle of relevance and procedural consequentiality is limiting for a full understanding of interactions such as for example native/non-native interactions that can be said to be highly influenced by power-relations and ideology, which are not necessarily related to the institutionality of the context and setting and are not necessarily systematically reflected in the shape, form, trajectory, content, or character of the interaction. Furthermore, as Day argues (2008), the methodological principle of procedural consequentiality raises problems for the study of cases where the relevance of certain categories for the participants are not demonstrable in the observation under study but in some previous observations. Similar to the position advocated in this thesis, Day suggests a broader context of investigation and explanation, the *messo* context, for the orientations and relevancies of the participants. What is highlighted by the argument raised by Day is the possible benefit of allowing the micro-analysis to be informed by contextual knowledge about the interactions, contexts and participants studied. And so we return to the issue of unmotivated looking, which is formulated as the guiding principle for conversation analysis, but which is hardly tenable in practice and analytically restrictive.

‘Unmotivated’ Looking?

In the paper *Whose terms, Whose ordinariness?* Michael Billig (1999b) contests Schegloff’s portrayal of the method of CA as unmotivated and uninfluenced by assumptions about the participants and the interactions studied. He argues that CA is not, as claimed, neutral in its investigations of talk-in-interaction and that they too impose certain pre-established categories and conceptualizations of the social world upon their analytic object. In Billig’s words CA *contains its own ideological and sociological assumptions* (Billig 1999b:544) that are manifested in a “foundationalist” and “specialist rhetoric” found in the portrayal of CA formulated by Schegloff and others (Billig 1999b:543). By this he means that CA research is first of all guided by assumptions about the social world as characterized by equality between the participants regarding rights to speak and act. This is what he refers to with the term *foundationalist rhetoric*. Such assumptions become problematic, Billig argues, when looking at interactions that are overtly influenced by power-relations, which is, as shown in section 2.2 and in the previous example, the case in the internship interview. Secondly, CA is guided very explicitly by what Billig refers to as *specialist rhetoric*, namely an extensive terminological framework that seeks to objectify the actions and behaviour of interlocutors, but

simultaneously represents and constructs such actions in a very specialized and theoretically informed way.

When Schegloff claims to present an indigenous perspective on participants actions and behaviour 'in their own terms' this ignores the fact that CA, as any other academic discipline, must be written (Billig 1999b:546), and that the writing of CA is highly based on a specialist descriptive terminology and a range of assumptions about the neutrality of interactions, which is manifested in the use of taken for granted and undefined terms such as conversation, member etc. Thus, CA is not neutrally representing the voice of the participants, but is imposing its own ideological assumptions about the social world on the object of research (Billig 1999b:548-549). Such ideologies, ironically perhaps, omit issues of power and ideology from the analytic gaze.

What Billig highlights by his counterargument is that all forms of analysis are interpretative enterprises, regardless of them being driven by critical or objectivist ambitions, and as such they are inherently guided by certain theoretical and epistemological assumptions and conceptualisations. While the position of CA as portrayed by Schegloff is valuable and admirable in its aims to describe ...*the indigenous preoccupation with grasping the social world...* (Schegloff 1997:165), it is either naïve or misleading in its suggestion that the analysis of talk-in-interaction does not involve interpretation, reconstruction and representation and that this process is not guided by academic discourse.

The point Billig makes is important because it disturbs the coarse distinction Schegloff makes between CA as an unmotivated and participant-oriented form of research and more critical forms of discourse analyses as theoretically driven and participant-imposing. Billig's argument highlights that all forms of research are representing and reconstructing their object of research in theoretically and academically inspired ways and that the goal of good research should not be to deny or try to overcome this fact but to examine and illustrate any claims made through close-grained analysis of actual discourse (Billig 1999b:544). Billig is hereby indirectly contesting the principle of relevance by arguing that the issue is not so much whether analysts bring their own categories and terms to the analysis, but rather the extent to which they commit to detailed analysis and documentation of these categories.

An Inductive and Yet Critical Perspective

The position taken in this thesis aligns with the argument presented by Billig that all forms of research of talk-in-interaction are ideologically and theoretically informed and with Billig's (1999b:544) and Schegloff's (1997:174, 180, 184) arguments that critical forms of discourse analysis should be based on fine-grained analysis of actual discourse. However, I would argue that the discussion of whether academic or theoretical terms such as ideology, membership categorization, turn-taking or gender is or should be imposed on an object of research is in itself an example of academic rhetorical dispute, which is somewhat side-tracking the central issue of relevance that, though in a somewhat broader form perhaps, applies to all forms of research. By this I mean to suggest that hardly any researcher, including Schegloff, would contest that all forms of research involves the application of a more or less academic and specialist frame of reference whether including notions such as turn-taking or gender.

What is central in the discussion between Billig and Schegloff regarding the question of relevance is not whether researchers use pre-established theoretical or other categories, but rather *how* such categories are used and what methodological status they are given. While neither Billig nor Schegloff seem to suggest that research categories can or should be excluded from the analysis and analytical description, they represent different positions with regards to how those categories should be derived and used. While Schegloff uses various analytical categories such as turn-taking and assessments, these categories are derived from the study of conversations and used in the study of conversations. On the other hand many critical discourse analysts use notions such as discourse and ideology that are analytic categories derived from abstract theoretical discussions and apply them to the study of interaction. Such application can be problematic if the realm of interaction is not examined in its own right, but merely used as a means of exemplification for already established theoretical assumptions.

The difference is one between empirically derived and driven categories as opposed to more theoretically developed categories and furthermore between aspiring towards unmotivated looked or guided looking, although the distinction between the two is of course blurred and problematic. The argument Schegloff presents, and which I to some extent agree with, is that it is not impossible to combine these two perspectives on discourse, but the analysis of the interactions in their own right should precede the macro-perspective on broader issues of power and ideology (Schegloff 1997:174,180,184).

The problem with combining a micro-analytical perspective with a broader perspective on structures of meaning and ideology is that the illumination, description and documentation of broader structures of meaning in the orientations and actions of the participants is so labour-intensive that it either ends up constituting the primary object of research or ends up being compromised in order to achieve a specific, and different, analytical end. Critical studies that pursue more large-scale questions and make observations and conclusions along broader lines in this way often end up compromising the interactional complexity that would support the arguments and claims made.

In Roberts & Campbell's recent study of job-interviews in Britain, the notion of discourse is used to describe and explain different forms of communication occurring and integrating in the job-interviews (see section 2.3.2) and they argue that these discourses are the causes of misalignments occurring between the participants. The problem with the notion of discourse as it is used here is, I would argue, that it seems to be a pre-established category that is used to make sense of certain utterances and responses to utterances and is not necessarily developed inductively. Although the examples shown in the study clearly suggest that such discourses could be at play and be causing the interactional problems, the description, delimitation and definition of these discourses gives way to the description of communicative barriers, misunderstandings and differences. Following the principle of relevance, the argumentation for systematic misalignments between for example an 'institutional discourse' and a 'personal discourse' should involve the detailed description of their manifestation in the actions and orientations of the participants throughout the entire data corpus. As Wetherell (1988) states, in relation to the identification of interpretative repertoires (see section 3.1.1), one has to show that different repertoires are systematically drawn upon in specific moments and ways in the interaction and that such repertoires are incommensurable. This can for example be done through showing how when different repertoires are used simultaneously rather than in different moments, the participants orient to their incommensurability and attempt to deal with it interactionally.

The point of mentioning the study by Roberts & Campbell is not to question their findings but rather to illustrate how the analytical prioritizing of a critical engagement with broader issues, such as miscommunication, in terms of large-scale notions such as discourse will inevitably compromise the fine-grained documentation for the manifestation of such constructs in the interactional actions and behaviour of the participants. In this thesis, the micro-

dimension of processes of meaning is prioritized and to the limited extent that generalizations are made about structures of meaning and patterns of behaviour, they are inductively derived. This, however, involves a different compromise, namely the inability to systematically investigate or make general conclusions about patterns in the behaviour of the various participants or other patterns that may significantly contribute to the interactional development and organization. Committing to the principle of relevance in this way involves an analytical compromise of perspectives and phenomena that may be relevant in relation to addressing a specific social issue or problem. Similarly, committing to solving a specific social issue necessarily involves compromises in the micro-analysis of the orientations and actions of the participants.

What is problematic in any form of analysis, whether oriented towards micro- or macro-dimensions of processes of meaning, is if a specific conceptual and terminological framework is applied without consideration of how its mere application shapes and delimits the given object of research. In this way, CA studies that isolate and claim the workings of the ‘machinery of talk-in-interaction’ and ignore the potential influence of broader structures of power and ideology are as problematic as critical studies of discourse that isolate and claim ‘structures of power and ideology’ and ignore the actions and behaviour of people. Such forms of analysis can be said to be the ones criticized by Billig and Schegloff respectively.

As argued by Billig, the problem with CA is that it prevents itself from analysing and describing interactions that are inherently characterized by power and ideology by assuming the equality of conversations. By claiming neutrality as a basic principle of ordinary conversation and applying this principle to all conversations, CA is unable to see power unless it is explicitly oriented to by the participants. In the same way Schegloff argues that critical discourse analysis cuts itself off from seeing ordinary aspects of interactions, because they assume power and power-relations. What is lost in their polarised and polemic discussion is the more pragmatic acknowledgement that the relevance of specific analytic or empirical categories is determined not only by the orientations and actions of participants in interaction, but by the orientations and research questions of the researcher. In both cases, this relevance should be documented and contextualised.

In this thesis, the categories of internship candidate, employer, Muslim and Danish are considered and documented as relevant for the participants on an interactional level. Furthermore, analytic categories such as Membership Categorization Devices, Ideology and

Culture are considered relevant on an analytic level since they can be shown to illuminate different, yet interrelated, aspects of the participants actions and orientations. The analytical onset was not an interest in ideology or turn-taking as such, but rather an interest in exploring processes of meaning related to the employment of immigrants and more specifically to the establishment of internships. Naturally, this choice of empirical object was influenced by an orientation towards specific categories such as ‘immigrants’, but the ensuing analysis of the data showed that this orientation was equally relevant for the participants themselves. If this had not been the case, these empirical categories would, and should, have lost their relevance for my research as well, or at least the relevance should have been questioned. In the same way the analytical perspective of the thesis is informed and enabled by knowledge of the principle of turn-taking and notions of ideology, but the legitimacy and relevance of these analytic categories is determined by the fact that such principles and processes were found and can be evidenced in my data.

The question of relevance is thus closely related to broader methodological principles of ‘good research’ as defined by the systematic illustration and support of an argument on the basis of a clearly defined object of research and a clearly defined theoretical and analytic framework. Furthermore, it is a question which is not only determined by the orientations of the participants, but rather somewhere in the circular process of choosing, investigating and redefining an object of research. In turn, this is a process that should be data-driven and indigenous in orientation, but is always influenced by the assumptions, understandings and knowledge of the researcher. This should not be considered a problem but an unavoidable premise of research that can be a useful and valid point of departure, as long as it is acknowledged and incorporated into the analysis.

A central part of the discussion of relevance is exactly the question of the analyst’s position with regards to the membership and knowledge of the participants. As described previously in this chapter (see section 3.2), EM and CA rest on the premise of membership knowledge as the resource used by participants in interaction to understand and interpret actions and to perform meaningful actions in response. Equally, this membership knowledge is the resource used by the analyst to understand and interpret actions and behaviour in interactions. This raises the question of whether a researcher can or should study interactions involving participants who have different linguistic and cultural memberships. I will not go into this discussion here, but merely focus on the fact that the analyst is considered to have

access to the same cultural, social and linguistic resources as the interlocutors studied and that this informs the analysis of what is going on.

In relation to the question of relevance one could argue that such membership knowledge enables and justifies the inclusion of categories that are not being explicitly oriented to by the participants. In other words, if the analyst sees gender, power or racism then such interpretations could be regarded as a result of his or her membership knowledge of the context of the situation and the membership categories put in play. However, as previously stated such intuitive interpretations need to be supported by in-depth interactional analysis and documented systematically throughout the data in order to be regarded as valid analytic observations.

There are however, different positions within CA regarding the extent to which such knowledge should be used as an analytical point of departure. Charles Antaki (Antaki & Widdicombe 1998b) describes how conversation analysts working with Membership Categorization Analysis are more prone to acknowledge and apply their membership knowledge, i.e. the knowledge acquired from being a member of a particular culture, when determining the meaning of a given categorization. He distinguishes this kind of work from another strand of CA research, which to a larger extent follows the work of Emmanuel Schegloff and is therefore sceptical of making analytical descriptions of categories that cannot be grounded in the utterances and orientations of the interlocutors. Within this strand, the focus is on the local function and use of categories and identities and how they interplay with the resources of conversational structures. No inferences are made about the meaning and attributes of specific categories used, unless these meanings and features are addressed by the interlocutors.

However, the distinction between what can be inferred and what cannot be inferred from participants' actions and orientations seems blurry and less clear cut than formulated by Schegloff and Antaki. As stated by Hester & Eglin in relation to their study of categories-in-context

...the meaning or sense of a category is constituted through the use of features of the context and the contextual features are themselves constituted through the sense of the category. (Hester & Eglin 1997c:26).

This quote emphasizes the fundamental interrelatedness of categories and context, but it simultaneously formulates the problematic abstractness of this interrelatedness, which makes it

difficult to draw the line between that which is a product of interaction and is therefore considered inductive knowledge and that which represents a resource for interaction and can only be described through abstraction and speculation. Consider the following example in which the employer in an internship interview suddenly topicalises a hijab that the candidate is wearing, though nothing in the transcript has previously made the category of Muslim relevant.

Extract 24: The Scarf ²¹

234 IN: Jeg er meget tålmodig o:g jeg [er] tenlig
 235 I am very patient a:nd I [am] friendly
 236 HO: [ja]
 237 [yes]
 238 (0.2)
 239 HO: .hja [.hhh
 240 .hyeah[.hhh
 241 IN: [og jeg er god til at [samarbejde med]
 242 [and I am good at at [cooperating with]
 243 HO: [Nadia nu jeg nødt til at spørge dig]=
 244 [Nadia now I have to ask you]=
 245
 246 =fordi jeg kan jo se du har beklædning på og når det [er]
 247 =because I can see that you are wearing a clothing and [when]
 248 IN: [ja]
 249 [*yes*]
 250 HO: man går rundt og har meget med hygiejne at gøre
 251 one is walking around dealing a lot with hygiene
 252
 253 IN: ja
 254 yes
 255 (0.2)
 256 HO: .h øhm (0.5) hvordan havde du tænkt dig at øh være klædt der
 257 .h eehm (0.5) how were you planning on eeh being dressed then
 258
 259 altså vi har jo hvide kitler vi har på .hh
 260 I mean we have white uniforms that we wear .hh
 261
 262 HO: [og] du skal nok have noget mindre ned over dig
 263 [and] you will probably need something smaller over you
 264 IN: [ja]
 265 [yes]
 266
 267 IN: ja jeg har l- en lille tørklæde.
 268 yes I have s- a small scarf.
 269
 270 HO: Det har du.=
 271 You do.=

Up until this point in the interaction the fact that the internship candidate is wearing a hijab and is probably Muslim has not been a subject of conversation, but at this point the hijab is used as a resource to make the category Muslim relevant. However, the term Muslim is not at this point mentioned and the issue of the scarf is addressed as a matter of dress requirements at the work-place. This makes it invalid, according to the principle of relevance in its most radical form, to describe the action of the employer as a topicalisation of religion. Although my membership knowledge as a citizen in a multicultural society and as a researcher working with immigrants and refugees, and my participation in the local context of the interaction tells me that the ‘dress’ worn is in fact a hijab, which signifies a specific form of category membership,

²¹ This extract is the continuation of extract 24: The scarf, presented in section 2.2.3.

this knowledge could not, following Schegloff, be validly applied to make sense of the actions of the employer.

In this specific sequence, this does, finally, not present a problem, since the employer, despite the solving of the proposed problem in line 271, keeps bringing up the issue of the scarf and finally does so in a way which makes explicit the relevance of the category Muslim. The point is, however, that the negotiation of context and category is often so deeply intertwined that trying to separate them in order to satisfy the principle of relevance may compromise our ability to describe the complexity of the participants' orientations and interpretations, since they too constantly use '*features of the context*' in order to construct categories and meaning, even if those features are not observable through the study of specific actions and words.

While it should remain an empirical question what categories are relevant for the participants in a given interaction, some categories are made available as interactional resources through our physical appearance or language characteristics and these are not always oriented to explicitly although they can be argued to have procedural consequentiality. Such categories are, as described previously in section 2.2.5, referred to as transportable identities by Zimmerman (1998), namely categories such as gender, age, and ethnicity that are carried across situations and furnish the intersubjective basis for categorization. In cases where this can empirically be argued to have procedural consequentiality even though it is not oriented to explicitly, the privileged position and knowledge of the analyst should be put in effect.

As illustrated by the example above, categories can be oriented to in very implicit ways that require various degrees of interpretation by the analyst and an extensive amount of membership knowledge, not only of the immediate interactional context but of broader structures of meaning and ideology. The position taken in this dissertation with regards to relevance and procedural consequentiality is that contextual knowledge about the participants and the speech situation can and should be included in the analysis to the extent that such knowledge can be demonstrated to be effectuated, tacitly or explicitly, by the orientations, actions and utterances of the participants. Although the discussions about procedural consequentiality, relevance and context within CA and not least between CA and DP can at times make the methodological implications of CA seem very strict, this position is the one that is often practiced, at least in more applied forms of CA research. As Antaki (Antaki & Widdicombe 1998b) and Billig (Billig 1999b) argue, even the field of 'core' CA following Schegloff draws

on the linguistic, social and cultural knowledge available in order to identify or name a given category used. The crucial point, in my view, is that any membership knowledge and theoretical knowledge used as an analytical onset is either investigated empirically or explicitly laid out as an assumption.

The position that CA is advocating is very useful in the sense that it broadens the analytical gaze and allows for more inductive and also surprising findings, since it prevents the analysis from being steered in a the direction of preconceived understandings and ideas about the context and the participants. However, I agree with Billig and Schegloff that the principle of relevance does not necessarily undermine or make impossible the critical ambition of many discursive psychologists, but rather brings attention to invalid or unreliable ways of doing analysis in general. As it is argued by Potter & Wetherell (1987; 1988), meticulous and thorough attention to sequences which challenges or deviates from the systematicity discovered is a prerequisite for valid and reliable discourse analysis. Although they are referring to the analysis of interpretative repertoires, the same applies to the study of categories in interaction. Even if the analytical outset is an interest in specific categories such as gender or ethnicity, the establishment and negotiation of these should clearly be demonstrated empirically to the same extent as any other identities that are made relevant during the interaction. This opens up the possibility of finding out that a given interaction was not about negotiating for example gender, but rather about doing actions and activities that made a whole other range of identities relevant. Moreover, it allows for the discovery of how the categories of interest are interrelated with other categories and actions as their negotiation and establishment unfolds in interaction.

3.3.2 Categorization, Common Sense and Ideology

This chapter has described social categories such as ‘Iranian’, ‘Danish’, ‘Muslim’ and ‘second-language speaker’ as products of verbal interaction. It has been argued, that such categories should not be considered created from scratch but constructed from the linguistic, semiotic, discursive and social resources afforded by the specific cultural, historical and social context that the participants of a given speech situation are part of, and embedded in²². This section presents a conceptualization of how categories and processes of categorization and particularization tie in with a cultural common sense. I will argue that the establishment of

²²See chapter 4 for a clarification of what is meant by culture.

categories related to nationality, language and religion, as processes of categorization in general, is influenced by fundamental properties of language processes that are linked to ideology and hereby to the social relations of power. This conceptualization is critical in the sense that it highlights and assumes the ideological nature of common sense and recognizes that ideology and common sense contribute to maintaining and reproducing social relations of power. However, as described in the previous section, this merely constitutes an analytical onset, whereas the object of the actual analysis in chapter 5 is the empirical examination of how categories related to nationality, language and religion are established and how patterns in this establishment can be said to reflect the common sense of a given cultural, historical and social context.

The establishment and negotiation of categories, or simply categorization, is a fundamental part of social interaction and talk-in-interaction. It is intimately linked with the act of particularisation that involves distinguishing and disassociating actions, people, things and other categories from the established categories (Billig 1996:163). The resources for processes of categorization and particularisation are the words, meanings and knowledge which are recognizable and meaningful within a given cultural, historical and social context. This idea is also found in the ethnomethodological conception of common sense (Garfinkel 1967:76-77). Here the focus is however not so much on specific meanings and words but more on social organization and sense-making more generally speaking (see section 4.3.3), which nonetheless includes membership categories and thereby words and meanings. As Sacks describes it:

A first thing we can say about this class of category sets is that its sets are 'which'-type sets. By that I mean that whatever number of categories a set contains, and without regard to the addition or subtraction of categories for that set, each set's categories classify a population. Now, I haven't made up these categories, they're Members categories....A second thing we can say about this class of category sets is that its categories are what we can call 'inference rich'. By that I mean, a great deal of the knowledge that members of a society have about the society is stored in terms of these categories (Sacks 1992a:40).

What Sacks is describing here is how processes of categorization involve the simultaneous constitution of and use of membership knowledge of categories and the social organization of such categories. Hence, the establishment and organization of categories and its association with certain actions, behaviours, traits and characteristics involves the reference to other categories, actions and meanings that are temporarily established or treated as real, factual, or beyond argumentation. While meaning is established in context by the orientations and actions

of the participants, no meaning is created from anew. As Billig states, following Barthes', the speaker is both master and slave of language:

The speaker can be portrayed as both master and slave. As slaves, speakers are condemned to recycle concepts, which function behind their back, or rather, through their larynxes. On the other hand, the speaker is the master of language: to speak is to assert the self, and the speaker is the hero who creates patterns of discourse, which have never been uttered before. The paradoxical nature of language-use suggests that theoretical attempts to dissolve, or resolve, the paradox will be less convincing than accounts which express the paradox itself (Billig 1991:8-9).

What Billig identifies here is the fundamental condition of processes of meaning, and thereby categorization, that the establishment of meanings and categories involves and imports a history of other meanings and categorizations. For this reason, the analysis of categories related to nationality, language and religion should not only focus on that which is being established and negotiated explicitly and implicitly, but should attend to the meanings, categories and knowledge that are assumed, and used as a basis of, such establishment and negotiation.

Some assumptions of meaning, knowledge and categories are formulated and repeated in ways that form patterns in form and function. Such patterns can be described as interpretative resources that are used in specific contexts of interaction and in specific contexts within an interaction for particular purposes. The notion of interpretative repertoires have already been described previously in section 3.1.1 and will be elaborated in section 4.5.7, but they should be mentioned here as examples of how ideology and common sense manifests itself and how it is tied to the specific interactional actions, meanings, and functions.

Assumptions, meanings and categories are not constant and stable points of reference for various constructions of meaning between the participants. The assumptions, meanings and knowledge expressed in relation to a specific construction of meaning constitute temporary fixations of a generally dynamic process of meaning. What is assumed and what is created changes from moment to moment in interaction, depending on the actions of the participants and the sequential context. With respect to the negotiation of categories, Billig formulates this dynamic relationship between an object of negotiation and the premises of this negotiation in the following way:

Just as the arguments about particulars can lead to arguments about categories, so, it will be suggested, the arguments about the essence of categories can lead to arguments about particulars (Billig 1996:176).

Processes of categorization are, given their embeddedness in a culturally specific history of meaning and a history of categorization, linked to a context of common sense and ideology. Gramsci's perspective on ideology, which has received a lot of attention and support within the field of Cultural Studies, highlights the influence of intellectual philosophies on the thinking of the ordinary individual, which describes how the common sense within a given context is shaped by broader ideologies about the social world. Or in Gramsci's own words:

If it is true that every language contains the elements of a conception of the world and of a culture, it could also be true that from anyone's language one can assess the greater or lesser complexity of his conception of the world. (Gramsci 1971:326)

What Gramsci pinpoints here is how the philosophies and conceptualizations of a given culture is carried by, and reflected in, language, but as is apparent from this quote Gramsci's notion of this relation between language and thought was rather deterministic²³. When Gramsci argued that every man is a philosopher, he was not praising the thinking of the masses but rather highlighting how this thinking was determined and enslaved by the thinking of the ruling class (Billig 1991:7).

The notion of ideology advocated in this thesis, on the other hand, is inspired by Michael Billig's interpretation of Gramsci, which is not as deterministic and much more compatible with a focus on meanings and categories as constructed rather than merely reproduced in interaction. Billig leans up against a specific passage in the Prison Notebooks where Gramsci formulates common sense as expressing differing conceptions of the world (Gramsci 1971:324) and argues that Gramsci's depiction of the individual as a slave of ideology does not acknowledge the controversial nature of common sense. As Billig states: "*Language should not be seen to contain a single conception of the world.*" (Billig 1991:21) Rather, language reflects a common sense which is dilemmatic and this dilemmatic property allows the formulation of critical opinions and attitudes and oppositional and polemic constructions of

²³ Gramsci uses the idea that one can assess the greater or lesser complexity of a person's conception of the world through that person's language to criticize incomplete language learning and the speaking of dialects. He argues that a person speaking with a dialect can only have a 'limited and provincial' intuition about the world and that it is therefore necessary to at least learn the national language properly (Gramsci 1971:325). This aspect of Gramsci's ideas about common sense, ideology and language is of course highly problematic and out of line with the perspective on language, culture and ideology presented in this thesis.

categories and meaning. Common sense then contains both the resources for ideological reproduction and stabilization and the potential for negotiation, challenge, re-establishment and change. Or as Billig eloquently puts it:

The paradox of ideology is a variant of a general paradox of language, for the use of language involves both autonomy and repetition. The speaker simultaneously is in charge of language and is captured by it. (Billig 1991:8)

Social relations of power

There is a further dimension to the link between language and ideology as formulated by Gramsci and Billig, which is central to a critical perspective on interactional processes of meaning and social organization, namely the idea that the common sense of a community maintains specific social relations of power. According to Gramsci, by reproducing the thinking of the ruling class, the ordinary person is also confirming and submitting to their domination. Ideologies are, in other words, not only manifested in language and processes of categorization, but in certain structures of social relations that determine the domination and power of some groups and individuals. Again the aforementioned determinism is resonating in such ideas. As Billig describes, people *...have become stereotypes, who reproduce stereotypes* (Billig 1991:8) This implies that people are unable to act or speak outside ideology and that even when they think they are challenging conventional or commonsensical ways of speaking, acting and behaving, they are merely reproducing the status quo and confirming its primary and superior status as common sense. A classic example of this is feminism that on the one hand seeks to challenge the unequal distribution of rights, privileges and status between men and women, but can only do so on the premises created by men and thereby reproducing and confirming their domination.

The notion of power applied in this thesis is, like the notion of ideology, dialectical rather than deterministic in the sense that language and interaction are regarded as both producing and reproducing a certain distribution of rights and power. Thus, the actions and behaviour of the participants in interaction both establishes a certain distribution of rights and manifest already established power structures and both of these forms of power can be analyzed by describing what is said and what is assumed.

This is particularly evident in institutional interactions where assessment plays a part and where there is an unequal distribution of rights to categorize related to the distribution of rights of the participants. In a study of report card meetings between school teachers, Mazeland and

Berenst (Mazeland & Berenst 2006) show the interrelation of an overall institutional organization of particular assessment practices and local processes of categorization. The structure of the school-system thus enables the actual report-card meeting event, and the school evaluation system makes it necessary to rank students in a certain way and hereby makes the pre-given categories of MAVO and HAVO²⁴ students relevant. Mazeland and Berenst apply Goffmann's term situated activity system to describe how the contextual embeddedness of the report-card meetings influences the organization of the decision-making. This contextual embeddedness includes the institutional hierarchy and the uneven distribution of power between teachers and students.

In relation to the internship interview, as described in detail in section 2.2, we see a similar interplay between the local membership categorization practices and a broader institutional, social, historical and cultural context, which influences the actions and behaviours of the participants and renders some categories, actions and meanings recognizable and common sense and others controversial, problematic and unthinkable. As described in chapter 2, the internship interview is enabled as an interactional event through the job-training program, which the internship candidate is participating in as part of an employment strategy effectuated by the municipality and ultimately the government. This employment strategy can be said to be a result of the large amount of immigrants and refugees on social support or welfare and the increasing gap between immigrants and non-immigrants on the labour market. In this way, the social and economical structures contribute to creating the possibility for the internship candidate to spend a month or two on an internship, which is funded by the government through social support or welfare and this creates the context and opportunity for the internship interview in the first place.

Not only do certain social and economical inequalities in this way enable and contextualize the speech situation of the internship interview, they also, as described in chapter 2, potentially influence the participation framework in projecting a certain distribution of rights and roles between the participants. The job-consultant, for example, is paid by the government to help the candidate in his or her job-search and is therefore responsible for establishing and participating in the internship interview. Although the context of the internship interview does not in any way determine a specific behaviour of the candidates, the various participants are

²⁴ MAVO refers to a mid-level type of secondary school and HAVO refers to a higher-level type of secondary school (Mazeland & Berenst 2006).

there as representatives of a certain position in the labourmarket and the well-fare system, that is either unemployed, employer and job-consultant and this influences the distribution of rights and actions available to each participant.

I will not repeat the findings from chapter 2 of the concrete manifestation and establishment of the participation frame, but I mention it here as an example of how ideologies such as those related to the well-fare system, employment, the community, citizenship and so on are intimately linked to social relations of power and how both of these realms enable, inform and potentially influence particular speech situations.

Envisioning possibilities for ideological challenge

Critics might question whether such a perspective on social interaction envisions or even allows for the individual to challenge ideology and social relations of power. The perspective presented above might seem to suggest that the participants are determined by the ideologies and social relations of power given within a context of Danish society, but this is far from the case. As explained, the ideologies of common sense are not homogenous and coherent, but rather dilemmatic and controversial and so are their manifestations in social relations of power. For example, the ideologies sustaining the welfare state seem to establish a relation of power between those that are employed and those that are unemployed, where the former, through paying taxes, support and sustain the living of the latter. From this perspective, the people who are employed are invested with power and the right to, through the legislative system related to welfare benefits, expect and demand the people who are unemployed to seek employment and participate in various programs to that effect. Following this logic, the unemployed internship candidate is the 'victim' in society who is at the mercy of the goodwill of the employers, the well-fare system and the job-consultants.

From a different perspective the well-fare system is a means of making or supplementing a living, without having to work from nine to five in a job with the restrictions on personal freedom and potential family life this entails. Some of the internship candidates were not even supported by well-fare benefits but by a spouse and were merely applying for an internship for the sake of professional and individual interest in a specific type of work. Following this logic, employment is not necessarily equivalent to being in power, but could be considered a form of slavery from ideas of capital accumulation and working life as a goal and an ideal in itself. Pushing this logic further, the unemployed internship candidate is the one in power of their

own life and time and in a position to work with something they find interesting and rewarding without having the responsibilities and obligations associated with an 'ordinary' job.

Although this example is speculative and hypothetical, it is presented for the sake of the argument that ideologies and social relations of power are fundamentally dilemmatic. Though they influence and inform social interaction, this does not imply that they determine social action. As Billig describes:

The rhetorical repetition is more than a repetition: the slaves can order their masters into new argumentative battles. Speakers might reproduce common sense, but their reproductions will not leave ideology unchanged.(Billig 1991:22)

In order to analyze the manifestation of ideologies and social relations of power in the actions and behaviours of individuals, one therefore has to study such actions and behaviours, as the interpretation, argumentation, establishment and enactment of ideology and power cannot be predicted on the basis of a critical perspective. Ideology and power are not only reproduced, but are potentially established and challenged within a specific speech situation or a specific utterance. As Billig further states:

Each echo is itself a distortion, for none can be a perfect repetition of what was already a series of repetitions. No two contexts are exactly identical, and, therefore, no two utterances can have precisely the same meaning. Each repetition will be a creation, bringing the past towards its future.(Billig 1991:22)

The close attention paid to the interpretation, argumentation, establishment and enactment of ideologies and social relations of power by specific participants within a specific context can thus challenge not only the assumptions and ideologies of a given time and place, but the very assumptions and ideologies of the analyst as well.

The Issue of Social Constructionist Relativism

One final thing that should be mentioned in relation to the conceptualization of categorization, ideology and power presented here is the implications it has for the analytical and theoretical contribution presented by the thesis as a whole. An interactional and social-constructionist perspective on processes of meaning and social organization applies to and shapes the object of the analysis as well as the analysis and the academic argumentation. The social constructionist attempt to reconstruct processes of meaning and deconstruct ideologies and structures of meaning represents an argument and a construction itself. This has invited and generated a

range of critical counterarguments, some of which contest either the epistemological or ontological constructionist position as such, and others which criticize the social constructionist or deconstructionist position for not taking stances or presenting alternatives.

There are many forms and levels of social constructionism and many forms of relativist critique and the attempt to recount and summarize these lies beyond the scope and aims of this thesis. But the issue of whether a social constructionist or rhetorical perspective on the social world enables or allows social critique is central to my thesis and should at least be touched upon.

A common critique of social constructionist relativism is based on the argument that a relativist perspective does not allow for normative prescriptions for change. A relativist position, the argument goes, presents all positions as equally constructed and therefore equally valid, and the possibility of knowledge and a critical stance is therefore denied. As described by Billig, this position has been presented by Habermas (1985; 1987) in a powerful critique of Derrida and Foucault, who both can be said to represent a radical ontological relativism. Billig (1991:23) refutes the argument presented by Habermas that a postmodernist or relativist position implies indifference and prevents critique and contends that the mere engagement in academic argumentation precludes indifference and presents a stance.

Gergen has a similar reply to the claim that social constructionist thinking is morally relativist and vacuous. He argues that social constructionism does not imply the abandonment of committed actions and engagement in social life, but merely advocates the critical exploration of the values and rationalities that sustain and inform this social life²⁵. He describes social constructionism as a critical positioning that claims neither neutrality nor superiority, and which neither precludes nor dictates action. He summarizes his position in the following way:

As I have argued, constructionism is a form of discursive positioning, an action in itself, and not a causal source of action. Nothing about constructionist relativism denies the possibility of moral commitment. While constructionism may give reasons for reflexive concern, it is not a replacement for normal life. In this sense, I will undoubtedly continue to engage in actions that seem good and right by certain standards – at times I may be strongly committed – but what is removed from the table, according to this view, is the justificatory base for these commitments, the

²⁵ It is not possible here to recount and do justice to the full argument presented by Gergen on the question of social constructionism and moral order. For further elaboration of his argument see (Gergen 1994 Chapter 4)

range of “sound reasons” that furnish ultimate sanctions for silencing (or destroying) the opposition. (Gergen 1994:113)

As argued by Gergen and Billig, the illumination of the social world as constructed and dilemmatic does, in other words, not prevent the representation of some constructions and positions as more persuasive and preferable to others. It merely recognizes the argumentative status of such representation and encourages counterarguments and allows for contrary positions. The propositions and findings of the analyst are in this way contributions to the arguments and dilemmas of common sense and they are themselves informed by common sense. As Billig formulates it:

The articulation of the critique does not represent a flight from present common sense into abstract theorizing. There need be no total rejection of common sense, if the radical hope is that the present conditions of inequality will be overcome. In the meantime, common sense can be turned against itself, for ideology will contain the seeds of its own critique. (Billig 1991:26)

Here, Billig turns his argument for the dilemmatic nature of common sense against himself and thus acknowledges his theoretical proposition as an argument itself, which enables and invites criticism and challenge. The position presented by Billig and adapted in this thesis may be summarized in following manner: While the rhetorical conceptualization of common sense as fundamentally dilemmatic could be said to imply an absolute relativism, this is not the case. The fact that common sense supplies the resources to present and argue different positions and different knowledge as equally meaningful does not prevent the advocating and preference for one position. As such, a rhetorical position is perfectly compatible with a critical perspective on some aspects of common sense and on the social relations of power that they can be argued to sustain. Obviously this position can itself be made the subject of critique which, from a rhetorical perspective, does not in and of itself undermine the validity or status of the position. Rather, it is a positive indication that knowledge, which was previously secured within the realm of unspoken assumptions, has been forced into a realm of explicit debate. Such achievement is the driving force and ambition of this thesis.

Chapter 4

Culture and language

What is at stake in all debates about nation making, ethnicity, and religious difference is invariably the idea of culture and what it is taken, by the different contenders in the multicultural debate, to signify. (Baumann 1999:24)

The opening quote by Baumann describes the widespread, conceptual link between culture and ethnicity, nationality and not least difference. This relation has been discussed and contested, and yet it has had a wide impact within academic contexts as well as within contexts of everyday life and ordinary conversation. The aim of this thesis is, as previously described, to describe how nationality, language and religion are negotiated and made relevant by the participants' actions and orientations within the context of an internship interview. As will be illustrated, the idea of culture, as stated by Baumann, is a central aspect of such negotiation. The notions of culture used and established as part of ordinary conversation are, however, not the object of attention in this chapter.

The aim of this chapter is to establish and present a theoretical notion of culture that can encompass and describe the communities of meaning that are established, manifested and form the basis of the talk-in-interaction between the participants in the internship interview. The notion of culture informing this thesis will, however, not be used for descriptive purposes in the analysis (see chapter 5). The aim of the analysis and the thesis in general is not to describe and define the culture of each participant or to determine the level of cultural sharedness or cultural difference between them. In fact, the aim is quite the opposite, namely to present a perspective on interaction and a notion of culture which highlights the interrelation of flexible, interwoven, and dynamic communities of meaning. Such communities are produced and used by the individual in different ways, in different contexts, and for different purposes. Furthermore, they provide the sharedness, knowledge, and competences that enable such production and use.

The definition of culture presented will not be used to identify and describe the various communities of meaning that the individual participants can be said to be members of, but rather to show how processes of meaning and categorisation develop from and transcend such communities. People establish and negotiate meaning first and foremost as individuals, and although the resources used for this process have a history and a context of use and meaning,

these resources can be no more ascribed to any particular individual than the produced meaning as such. Scollon and Scollon present the dilemma like this:

From an interactional sociolinguistic perspective, discourse is communication between or among individuals. Cultures, however, are large, superordinate categories; they are not individuals. Cultures are a different level of logical analysis from the individual members of cultures. Cultures do not talk to each other; individuals do. In that sense, all communication is interpersonal communication and can never be intercultural communication. (Scollon & Scollon 2001:138)

The point made here by Scollon and Scollon is methodological rather than theoretical; they do not propose a rejection of the notion of culture or the idea of cultural membership. Instead, they suggest that the study of interaction should be distinguished from the analysis of culture and focus on individuals as persons rather than cultural personifications. Similarly, what is proposed in this chapter, and in the thesis in general, is not the total rejection of the notion of culture, since it is useful as a theoretical conceptualization of the communities that individuals establish and associate themselves and others with. Rather, what is proposed is the methodological separation of theoretical discussions of culture from the analysis of interactional processes of meaning and an analytical emphasis on interpersonal processes of meaning. Such processes formulate the bedrock of the constitution, negotiation, and challenge of various cultural communities and community memberships.

This chapter presents different aspects of the notion of culture that have historically been associated with the term. These different aspects, namely sharedness, resource, strategy, difference and language, influence the definition offered at the end of this chapter. Here, culture will be presented as flexible communities of meaning constituted in a two-dimensional process of knowledge accumulation and membership categorization.

4.1 Culture as Sharedness and Resource

The study of social interaction highlights the micro dynamics of social organization and processes of meaning. On a more general level, it highlights how people are social individuals who for various reasons interact with each other on a more or less regular basis. Through--and in--such interactions we organize ourselves and others in relation to various groups, and this organization of groups and meanings can itself be said to constitute culture. Culture is the sense-making and organizational machinery of human practice. Or in Bauman's phrasing: "*...the continuous and unending structuring activity...*" (Bauman 1973:56), hereby describing the sui generis of culture as structuring action. This perspective on culture is highly compatible

with an ethnomethodological and discursive psychological framework such as the one presented in this thesis.

Within ethnomethodology, culture is often described in relation to the concept of *common sense* (see section 3.1.2, 3.3.2), which is considered the accumulation of members' knowledge of the organization of social life and the dynamic moment-to-moment structuring of participants in interaction is considered the locus of culture (Garfinkel 1967:76). While the ideas of shared membership knowledge and recognisability are considered fundamental to interactional organization and meaning construction, the category 'Members' is not defined. Ethnomethodology and conversation analysis were developed in the United States, and the shared membership knowledge and cultural common sense referred to seems to imply and include this context only. This is of course problematic, as the ethnomethodological framework and the empirically generated CA notions have been widely applied outside the context of the United States. Furthermore, it is problematic, because the notion of membership knowledge assumes the internal similarity and homogeneity of Americans. This is obviously as much of an illusion as the similarity of any other group.

Methodologically, the problem is partly solved within CA, as the principle of relevance, procedural consequentiality and unmotivated looking all seek to ensure a participant perspective on processes of meaning and social organization. Thus, one is to some extent able to capture the differences in understanding, misunderstandings, and break-downs in communication that could potentially arise from lack of sharedness or differences in membership knowledge. However this does not change the fact that a fundamental sharedness and recognisability of the machinery of talk-in-interaction is assumed such as the principles of turn-taking, TCU's, Membership Categorization Devices, Pre-faces etc. This is problematic when considering the heterogeneity of people in general, which is increasing with the effects of globalization.

This issue has been addressed by some CA studies that have sought to illuminate and describe cultural differences in the social organization of talk, such as Michael Moermann's study of the language of indigenous groups in Thailand and William Hanks study of the language of indigenous groups in Mexico. These studies seek to contrast the findings about the English or American language use with findings about the use of other languages. Other studies have tried to compare specific aspects of talk-in-interaction in different languages such as Susanne Kjærbeck's study of differences in discourse units in Mexican and Danish business

meetings (Kjærbeck 1998b). The results of such studies refine the system of talk-in-interaction, but they do not as such contribute to a discussion or refinement of the notion of sharedness, membership or cultural common sense on which this system rests.

What is missing within the field of **ethnomethodology** and Conversation Analysis is a more general discussion of the notion of *ethnos*. This was the term used in the middle of the 19th century to refer to a ‘people’ understood as a group of individuals with a common culture, which is exactly the idea that is in most cases implied within CA studies. This implicit, undefined and untenable idea of cultural sharedness needs to be replaced by a more explicit definition of culture that can encompass the various intertwining common senses, memberships and communities of sharedness. Such communities and common senses enable the reproduction and recognition of social organization and meaning but also provide the seeds for the challenge and change of such.

Social interactions constitute and are informed by a web of relations with other people with whom we share or come to share certain practices, meanings and understandings. When considering the entire population of the world, no practices, meanings and understandings are shared by everybody and while everyone shares something with everybody else, everybody shares more with somebody than somebody else. And not least, we each have a stronger sense of sharedness with some rather than others, whether this feeling is real or not. The anthropological notion of culture in its traditional form was an attempt to capture the sharedness that can be said to evolve between members of the same civilization, society or nation, which was first formulated in the following way by evolutionist Edward Burnett Tyler in 1870:

Culture or Civilization, taken in its wide ethnographic sense, is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society. (Tyler 1871:1)

Although this definition has been revised, criticised and even abandoned in later attempts to define culture, Hastrup describes how it has been programmatic for anthropology ever since and represents a foundation for anthropological conceptualizations of culture (Hastrup 2004:11). What Tylor’s definition highlights is the anthropological conceptualization of culture as a unifying factor that shapes the knowledge, beliefs, practices and products of its members through processes of socialization and interaction. Such definitions are convincing in their inclusiveness and their naturalizing reference to people’s membership of ‘society’ as a

commonsensical unit. Most people thus consider themselves members of one society or another and have the idea that such membership implies sharedness with other members of the same society. This sharedness is however, as suggested previously, not a given and becomes increasingly difficult to assume or imagine given the effects of globalization and the increased mobility in the world today. The notion of culture as sharedness however prevails, perhaps partly because of the commodity of the term and partly because of its intimate ties with other notions and ideas such as the Nation-state, the idea of The West and The Rest and not least the idea of an intimate link between culture and language.

All of these ideas are part of the history of the term culture, the summary of which lies beyond the scope and aims of this thesis. However, as described by anthropologist Kirsten Hastrup (2004), the classificatory and descriptive ideals of Enlightenment combined with the Romantic ideas of the uniqueness of different Nations and their peoples, which was central in the work of important figures such as Herder, Humboldt and Boas, contributed to forming an essentialist and absolute notion of culture as separate units that defined the thought and practice of its members. Boas' establishment of Anthropology in the United States constituted the cultural-relativist and anti-hierarchical notion of culture, which has dominated most of American Anthropology ever since (Risager 2006:40-43). The legacy of Boas was on the one hand a holistic approach to cultures as separate, integrated units and on the other hand a comparative approach which, based on the gathering of ethnographic materials, sought to compare the differences between cultures (Risager 2006:41). The influence of Boas and the development of cultural relativism in general²⁶ meant that up till the 60'ies and 70'ies, the notion of culture as order was not questioned (Hastrup 2004:53). Furthermore it led to the understanding that individual differences between cultures made it difficult if not impossible for a person from one culture to understand a person from another culture (Risager 2006:42). This is a logic that is implicitly reflected in much research of 'intercultural' encounters even though the cultural relativist tenets are explicitly abandoned.

This notion of culture is, as mentioned, of course problematic in a world that is increasingly characterized by mobility of people and ideas and the continuing transgression of national, geographical, ethnic and social boundaries that could previously be used to define the

²⁶ Risager makes a distinction between three forms of cultural relativism: Conventional, which refers to differences between cultures and the mentalities of their members; ethical, which refers to the inter-cultural differences in norms and values that are a product of a socio-historical development; and epistemological, which refers to the gaps between cultures that prevents us from understanding one another. A special variety of the latter is the Whorfian linguistic relativism which formulates a close relation between language and thought.

thought and behaviour of its members. In his famous article *Travelling Cultures*, Clifford (1992) argues that our understanding of culture has been highly influenced by the practice of anthropologists who, following Malinowski and Boas, thought that the essence of a culture could be studied through dwelling for longer periods of time in a village, studying the practices of natives and the field as if it were a laboratory. This has had the effect of marginalizing and erasing the blurred areas of culture that are characterized by travel, translation, transversal between the context of study and other contexts that the researcher and subject move in and out of. It has contributed systematically to the neglect of the study of culture *as* travel. As formulated by Clifford:

Anthropological “culture” is not what it used to be. And once the representational challenge is seen to be the portrayal and understanding of local/global historical encounters, co-productions, dominations, and resistances, then one needs to focus on hybrid, cosmopolitan experiences as much as on rooted, native ones. In my current problematic, the goal is not to *replace* the cultural figure “native” with the intercultural figure “traveller”. Rather the task is to focus on concrete mediations of the two, in specific cases of historical tension and relationship. In varying degrees, both are constitutive of what will count as cultural experience... If we rethink culture and its science, anthropology, in terms of travel, then the organic, naturalizing bias of the term culture – seen as a rooted body that grows, lives, dies, etc – is questioned. Constructed and disputed *historicitities*, sites of displacement, interference, and interaction, come more sharply into view (Clifford 1992:101).

Studying internship interviews where the participants have different cultural backgrounds in the sense that they are born in different countries does not mean that their behaviour should be considered as a reflection of the culture of the respective countries. As argued by Clifford, the background, socialization and historicity of the participants cannot be reduced or confined to the context of birth. Furthermore, regardless of whether some of the participants had in fact been both born and raised within a single national cultural context, this context can never be entirely and clearly defined as self-contained, absolute and uniform and will not be useable as a frame of reference for the behaviour of its people.

This does not mean that one should deny the possible influence of the different cultural memberships of the participants in the internship interviews. Rather it means that one should consider these differences as less straightforwardly and predictably determined by ethnic origin, or country of birth and more an outcome of a history of practice in and across various national, cultural, religious, social and ethnic boundaries. What is needed is a notion of culture that can be used to differentiate between different communities, but does not necessarily

conflate the idea of community with large-scale constructs such as Nations, civilizations or societies. Such communities do not necessarily influence or define the meanings, practices and understandings of all its members. Instead they constitute the ‘idea’ of sharedness, which is reflected in Tylor’s reference to society and the ethnomethodological reference to culture. As Anderson argues in relation to the Nation-State, such large-scale communities are imagined rather than real, since most of their members do not share much besides the very idea of the community as such and the sharedness of its members. Or in Anderson’s words:

It is *imagined* because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion. (Anderson 1991:15)

The point Anderson makes in relation to the Nation-State applies to the notion of culture as well, and illuminates part of the reason why culture – in the absolute and essentialist sense – is continually referred to as the source of conflict, misunderstandings and differences between people: Culture has become an ideology that influences the way people interpret themselves and others. The wide recognition and adaptation of the notion of culture as a unit with a particular substance that determines the practice and values of its members was more or less left unchallenged for almost a hundred years until the middle of the 20th Century. Within this period it has grown to influence the thinking of the general public as well. In Gramsci’s terms, the notion of culture has become sedimented in the philosophy of the ordinary (wo)man in the same way that the Freudian terminology of Ego, Superego and repression has been adapted as a general truth about the human psyche. Or as Hastrup explains:

The problem is that although anthropology analytically has problematized this substance thinking, it still constitutes a powerful dimension of people’s understanding of self. It was not least due to the anthropological descriptions of cultures as a whole, that people generally began to define themselves in cultural terms. (Hastrup 2004:88)

4.2 Culture as Strategy or Product

One of the central problems with the notion of culture as a shared overarching community unifying and determining its members is that culture is described as something we are, which fails to emphasize that it is also something we do. Culture is the product of, as much as the resource for, actions and processes of meaning. Or as anthropologist Brian Street (1993) formulates it, “*Culture is a verb*”. One central aspect of ‘doing culture’ consists of ascribing meaning to the contexts and practices of our individual life history and as such it is a process

inseparable from processes of meaning and representation. The notion of culture defined by Boas and his followers such as Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict was used for descriptive and classificatory means, which lost sight of the individual on behalf of the whole. This perspective became untenable as the world quickly evolved and changed vis-à-vis the effects of colonisation and globalization. What developed as a response to and a criticism of such absolute and deterministic notions of culture was a notion of culture as situational and processual and cultural membership as individually produced and defined. As already mentioned the work of James Clifford is important in illustrating that culture is not constituted by a given time and place of residence but by travel and movement in time and place of individuals.

Another central figure contributing to the development of a situational, processual and individual notion of culture is Fredrik Barth, who considered the organization of social life from a processual perspective and emphasized the individual's role in generating such organization. Thus, Barth enables the description of regularity and recognisability of culture, while simultaneously challenging the notion of culture as monolithic structures that determine the practices and thoughts of their members. His perspective on the constitutive process of forms of social life and his emphasis on individual choice and action as the driving force of this process are very compatible with the ethnomethodological framework of this thesis and the approach to culture presented in this chapter. As proposed in this thesis, patterns and repetitions of actions are used to illuminate the social organization of social life and such patterns are considered to generate rather than determine social action:

The most simple and general model available to us is one of an aggregate of people exercising choice while influenced by certain constraints and incentives. In such situations, statistical regularities are produced, yet there is no absolute compulsion or mechanical necessity connecting the determining factors with the resultant patterns; the connection depends on human dispositions to evaluate and anticipate. Nor can the behaviour of any one particular person be firmly predicted – such human conditions as inattentiveness, stupidity or contrariness will, for the anthropologist's purposes, be unpredictably distributed in the population. This is also how we subjectively seem to experience our own social situation. Indeed, once one admits that what we empirically observe is not 'customs', but 'cases' of human behaviour, it seems to me that we cannot escape the concept of choice in our analysis: the central problem becomes what are the constraints and incentives that canalize choices. (Barth 1966:1)

As a result of this focus on social forms as generated by human practice, Barth challenges the notion of culture as separate units whose boundaries have been defined and maintained historically and geographically. Instead, he focuses on the constitution of ethnic groups and their boundaries through social processes of exclusion and incorporation. What Barth (1998a:15) proposes is the emphasis of “...*the ethnic boundary that defines the group, not the cultural stuff that it encloses.*” He hereby expresses a notion of culture as the ‘content’ shared by members of ethnic groups and suggests a study of this ‘cultural stuff’ as it is brought to bear and deployed by the individual in their constructions of and affiliations with ethnic identities and ethnic boundaries.

Such constructions of ethnic groups, boundaries and identities are also considered by Barth to be ‘cultural matters’. However, as Barth argues, a description of the processes in which ethnic groups and boundaries are constituted rather than the content of culture highlights the “cultural materials” that people themselves deploy. It does not merely emphasize what the researcher finds relevant for characterising differences between groups (Barth 1998c:6). Hence, Barth’s conception of ethnic identity implies cultural sharedness and differences but is based on the idea that they are constituted between individuals within and across various boundaries of social relations. Or in Barth’s words

”...ethnic distinctions do not depend on an absence of social interaction and acceptance, but are quite to the contrary often the very foundation on which embracing social systems are built.”(Barth 1998a:10)

Processes in which ethnic groups and differences are constituted are thus both influenced by – and generative of – culture. ‘Doing culture’ is hereby involved in ‘doing ethnicity’, but the former is not reduced to the latter.

Barth’s notion of culture as something which is deployed and established in processes of ethnic boundary constructions resonates with the discursive psychological perspective on categorization proposed in this thesis. However, Barth was not interested in the micro dynamics of processes of meaning and social organization, but rather in describing the constitution of ethnicities as individual strategies in a politicized and ideological social reality. These two levels of ‘doing culture’ are, however, intimately related.

What Barth highlighted (and what micro-analysis of interaction also illuminates) is that people produce group memberships with which they associate or dissociate themselves and others. They do so for a range of more or less strategic purposes within various contexts

influenced by ideology and controversy, and this process involves the production of similarity and difference. Group membership, sharedness, similarities and difference are thus exposed as the product rather than the basis of human interaction (Barth 1998a:15). Furthermore, by emphasizing the constitution of ethnic groups and ethnic identities rather than culture, Barth moves the focus away from the notion of culture as a unit or a system of practices and beliefs and emphasizes the people that constitute culture.

Since the middle of the 19th Century where the term ‘ethnos’ had been used to refer to ‘peoples’ (Hastrup 2004:87), the term ethnicity had gradually evolved to refer to ‘racial’ characteristics. Around the time of the Second World War, it was used in the United States as a polite way of referring to Jews, Italian or Irish, i.e. to immigrant groups who were not, unlike the majority, of British descent (Eriksen 2002:4). Such descriptive uses of the notion of ethnicity to refer to ‘sub-cultural’ groups, or various ‘minority cultures,’ reproduces the notion of culture as separate, absolute and homogenous units only in smaller scale, whereas the notion of ethnicity proposed by Barth highlights how such groups and ethnicities are strategically and politically formed in the processes of social organization.

Thus, Barth’s work resonates with the anti-generic surge within the disciplines of Cultural Studies and Postcolonial Studies, where the question of minority versus majority and the meaning of social categories such as gender, race, ethnicity, and class has been a central object of study. The destabilization of such categories within Cultural Studies and Postcolonial Studies and the influence from social-constructionist thinking facilitated and inspired the political claim to equality of rights and possibilities on behalf of one or the other minority group (Grossberg 1996; Gergen 2001)²⁷. Hence, the notion of ethnic or cultural membership as an individual strategy presents a promising alternative to a deterministic notion of culture and may be used critically to highlight and challenge the inequality between different groups. When individuals are considered as participants within and across various communities of meaning, they can no longer be considered determined by a particular affiliation with a specific group or community. Rather, each individual is to be conceptualized as central figure in the constant definition and negotiation of various ‘cultures’ through his/her practice and behaviour in them. Consequently, the situational and processual notion of ethnic group membership and the ‘cultural stuff’ that it involves express an emphasis on heterogeneity, particularity and

²⁷ Gergen and Grossberg refer to such claims to specific rights on behalf of a particular group membership as *identity politics*.

contextuality in the understanding of culture and social reality and a dominant interest in social interaction.

The problem with a situational and practice-oriented perspective on culture, such as the one presented by Barth, is that the emphasis on culture as process overshadows the cumulative and structuring effect of repeated action that produces cultural recognisability. The emphasis on culture or cultural membership as established in processes and strategies of boundary maintenance (Barth 1998b) tends to underplay the sharedness of meanings, practices and understandings that enables and influences such processes and evolve from the repeated interactions of community members. As formulated within ethnomethodology (Heritage 1984b:241), social activities, such as those involved in the boundary maintenance described by Barth, rest on accumulated members' knowledge and competence as well as structuring practice.

A notion of culture as process and ethnicity as situational strategy is in this sense meaningless or problematic, if it does not acknowledge and recognize that the repetition, accumulation and social organization of meanings and practices generates a range of more or less stable communities of sharedness. Such communities have been shown to differ by anthropologists, sociologists, ethnomethodologists and conversation analysts and can be delineated with reference to national, geographical, social, political and historical parameters. Culture is thus, on the one hand, practice in the sense that it is organized, structured and constructed through practice and social interaction, and it is therefore constantly in flux, changing and being negotiated. On the other, culture is the generated recognisability of practice and provides the resources for practice.

A definition of culture should thus include the production and maintenance of community borders as well as the sharedness that enables this production. Like language, culture is not merely constantly invented and reinvented, but is rather a product of repeated practices and the continual negotiation and redefinition of a history of practice. Culture is, in other words, practice as well as the resources for practice. The central question then is how to define, understand and recognize culture as communities of sharedness, while avoiding the generalizing, absolutist and reductionist notions of culture. Although such notions may have been abandoned theoretically within anthropology, they nevertheless often accompany a differential perspective on culture within an academic context as well as ordinary life.

4.3 Cultural Difference and Differentiation

As argued so far, there is a need for a notion of culture that encompasses the accumulated sharedness of various communities of meaning and the situational processes, through which communities and community membership are constituted, made relevant, oriented to and used by people in various ways, for various purposes and in various contexts. What is proposed is a differential notion of culture, which not only considers the sharedness of communities to be dynamic, but also conceptualizes cultural difference as continually constituted and redefined in processes of meaning and social organization. The challenge when working with a differential notion of culture as opposed to a strictly situational one is to avoid the pitfall of reproducing the reductionist and absolutist notions of culture as overarching structures of meaning related to nationality and language.

There has been a tendency within linguistic anthropology, sociolinguistics and even applied CA to focus on culture above other factors as soon as culture could be said to be potentially relevant. This has led to a vast amount of studies of interactions labelled native/non-native, intercultural and inter-ethnic and the exploration of differences in communicative behaviour and interpretation of between people 'belonging' to different cultural, ethnic, religious, linguistic or social groups. One of the reasons for this emphasis on 'cultures', 'ethnicities' and 'communities' may be the continuing prevalence of the idea that culture is closely linked to language and of the structuralist notion that cultures constitute separate units of ideas, norms of practices that are internalized and manifested in the actions and interpretations of its members. Another reason is the fact that a focus on culture has the tendency to erase other differences and other actions (Hastrup 2004:69,75).

The problem with studying cultural difference is that just as one cannot assume the sharedness of the members ascribed to a given culture, one cannot assume the difference between members ascribed to different cultures. Sharedness of meaning, values, and understandings is produced, reproduced and confirmed in social interaction. This process is different from, yet interwoven with, the production of similarity and difference, which is related to processes of categorization and strategies of constituting groups and members as described by Barth. The approach to cultural difference proposed in this thesis is one that focuses on the interlocutors as speakers whose membership of various interwoven communities of meaning is established in the negotiation of meaning as well as the processes of categorization.

4.3.1 Inter-Acted and Inter-Related Communities

It has been argued so far that what is often referred to as culture, i.e. people's membership of various social groups, can be studied as an interactionally produced phenomenon of membership categorization. As described, various levels of membership categories are established and oriented to in relation to different activities and for various purposes. Although, as argued in chapter 2, some are more closely linked to the speech situation, while others are linked to broader structures of meaning, different categories and memberships are woven together in interaction. A person may thus be categorized as a woman, an internship candidate, a Muslim, an Iranian and a professional kindergarten teacher without this constituting a problem for the interaction, or for the activities being carried out. Categories are interrelated and interacted in processes of meaning and social organization. As will be further explored in chapter 5, the perspective on social categories proposed in this thesis illuminates the micro-dynamics of processes of culture and reveals the multitude of communities that are available for – and produced by – individuals as well as their interrelatedness.

Within the field of Cultural Studies, culture and cultural identity has for quite some time been described as a relational, dynamic and processual phenomenon, but these descriptions have been largely theoretical. While there has been a lot of discussion about the subject's placement in discourse and processes of subjectification, little attention has been paid to actual subjects in interaction (Rampton 1999:6; Harris 2006). As stated by Harris:

Sociologists and cultural studies specialists interested in questions of ethnicity and culture have routinely overlooked the importance of the everyday patterns of language use of ordinary people. Conversely, sociolinguists have traditionally studied the language use of ethnic minority groups employing relatively unsophisticated and essentialist notions of ethnicity, culture and community. (Harris 2006:3)

What is proposed by Harris here is that cultural studies, sociology and sociolinguistics underemphasize the actual processes in which ethnicity and culture is constituted. What is suggested in this thesis is that such an emphasis illuminates the constitution not only of ethnicity, but of a range of interrelated groups and group memberships.

Recently, within Cultural Studies, and more specifically among critical feminist theorists, there has been much discussion about the concept of *intersectionality*. The concept has been discussed among critical feminist theorists (Collins 1998; Lykke 2003; Carbin & Tornhill 2004), and has been used to highlight the intersection and intertwining of various

social categories and processes of subjectification. It has primarily been used to describe crossings of social categories such as gender, race and class on a broader discursive and sociological and structural level. Furthermore, it has been reworked on a post-structuralist and social-constructionist basis to be used on a subject level to describe situational processes of identity (Staunæs 2003). While Staunæs builds a strong argument for the potential of such a reworking of the concept of intersectionality, based on the analysis of interviews and observations in two Danish schools, I believe that this potential can be explored even further by looking at actual interactions from an interactional perspective.

What has been shown in chapter 2 and will be further illustrated in chapter 5 is how the intersection of categories within an interaction can be described as a result of the participants negotiating, establishing and inquiring into the social and discursive order that is available to them as participants in particular speech situations and a broader cultural and social context. The categories established and made relevant in an interaction are, in other words, a product of talk in interaction by participants doing activities and producing meaning and social organization. The analysis in chapter 5 demonstrates that from an interactional perspective, processes of membership categorization will always involve the intersection of identities or membership categories. Various categories inevitably intertwine, as they are woven into the fabric of conversation and interaction.

4.4 Culture and Language

The prevalence and resilience of the notion of culture as an overarching and large-scale community closely linked to, if not conflated with, nations, civilizations and societies is related to the idea that culture and language are inseparable. As described by Hastrup, the relationship between language and culture has been central to the history of the notion of culture since Herder and was cemented in the European Romantic period where language was considered to define the soul of peoples (Hastrup 2004:98). Furthermore, as described by Karen Risager (Risager 2006:1), it has been highlighted within large sections of linguistics, including anthropological linguistics, sociolinguistics, research into intercultural communication, translation, language acquisition and language teaching, since the 1990'ies. Finally, the relationship between language and culture is assumed and implied, although not described or explained, in other academic disciplines where language and culture are not formulated as the primary objects of research. Ethnomethodology is one example of this. Within ethnomethodology, culture is considered to be common sense membership knowledge,

accumulated through the structuring practice of people in every life. Language is considered an aspect of social life that is at once reflecting and generating such knowledge. Hence, language is implicitly considered to reflect and generate culture.

While there is no doubt that language and culture are intimately related, the idea of the inseparability of language and culture is problematic, because it is often unambiguously assumed and tends to imply a simple identification of language and culture (Risager 2006:1). Risager proposes an integrated conceptualization of language and culture in the sense that she considers all language practice to be cultural, but establishes an analytical distinction between the two in order to examine their relationship. She uses 'language' to refer to linguistically formed culture, which involves spoken and written 'text'²⁸, and 'culture' to refer to non-linguistically formed culture (Risager 2006:5-6). Risager argues that culture and language in a generic sense are inseparable, but that they *can* in certain respects be separated, when considered differentially, i.e. in relation to specific languages and cultures (Risager 2006:2-6). She summarizes the relation between language and culture in the following way:

Language and culture are thus both inseparable and separable at one and the same time. Language has considerable elasticity as a tool in all types of context and in connection with all kinds of content. So I have sometimes called language a Velcro fastener: language can easily change context and thematic content, but once it has been introduced into a new place and/or is used for a new content, it quickly integrates and 'latches on'. (Risager 2006:196)

The complex theoretical conceptualization of relation between language and culture will not be summarized here, but the perspective offered on culture and language as integrated yet not inseparable phenomena will be adopted. The purpose in this section is not to describe the relationship between language and culture in relation to specific languages and cultures, but rather to describe the integrated conceptualization of the relationship between culture and language, which informs the definition of culture offered in the end of this chapter. This will involve an exploration of several theoretical conceptualizations of language as culturally shared and culturally embedded, but also of conceptualization of language as culturally constitutive. Consequently, language will be presented as, at once, a manifestation of culture

²⁸ Risager here refers to text in a broad linguistic sense as it is used within critical discourse analysis and systemic functional linguistics.

and constitutive of culture, as enabled by sharedness and productive of sharedness, as deployed in social interaction and achieved in social interaction²⁹.

4.4.1 Culture as Communities of Meaning

There is no doubt that language is one of the primary means by which we communicate and establish meaning and social organization with others. Through socialization and repeated interactions and practices with others, we generate communities of meaning that make communication and processes of meaning and social organization easier. We accumulate knowledge, words, meanings and understandings related to specific context or communities of meaning such as work, family and friends, which means that we do not have to start from scratch every time we meet other members of such communities. Or as formulated by Kramsch “...*language expresses a cultural reality*.”(Kramsch 1998:3 emphasis in original)

However, as mentioned in the discussion of culture as an overarching deterministic system of meaning linked to a given culture is problematic, since such a system can never determine or define the language and interpretation of all its speakers. The problem with a notion of culture as a semantic system is that it does not account for individual action and for the new meanings that arise in the meeting of specific language uses and meanings of particular communities of meaning and practice. The notion of culture as an overarching system of meaning and discourse does not allow for particularities and individuals and can only describe the reproduction rather than the production of meaning. Language not only expresses, but *embodies* a cultural reality (Kramsch 1998:3) in the sense that it is constitutive of this reality.

There is a need for a notion of culture as communities of meaning that are not necessarily defined by national languages, but encompass the shared meanings and understandings that cut across such language boundaries and/or are distinctly associated with a particular practice or context, as well as the hybrid expressions of language and meaning that evolve in the crossing, intertwining and transcendence of languages as a result of the mobility of people and the redrawing of borders.

²⁹ The notion of language applied in this thesis is an extended conception as formulated within both Cultural Studies and ethnomethodology, which includes not only verbal language, but a whole system of meanings, signs and symbols as expressed through actions, behaviour, bodylanguage, visual and aesthetic phenomena etc. However, while these various dimensions of language are considered to be involved in and influential to processes of meaning and social organization, they will not be systematically included in the analysis, where only verbal language is considered.

The sharedness which can be defined by the notion of culture should not be reduced to a person's membership of an overarching language community, but should refer to the various communities of meaning of which people have acquired membership through their individual history of participation and practice. Such communities are enabled and constituted by language, but they are furthermore defined by the idea of sharedness and the idea of language as central to this sharedness. The former is, as mentioned previously, described by Anderson in relation to the Nation-state, but the latter is described by Kramsch as yet another aspect of the link between language and culture besides the two already mentioned. She formulates it in the following way:

Finally, language is a system of signs that is seen as having itself a cultural value. Speakers identify themselves and others through their use of language; they view their language as a symbol of their social identity. The prohibition of its use is often perceived by its speakers as a rejection of their social group and their culture. Thus we can say that *language symbolizes cultural reality*. (Kramsch 1998:3 emphasis in original)

The relationship between language and culture as manifested in relation to the expression, constitution and symbolization of shared communities of practice and meaning has been explored and described outside anthropology with other terms such as speech community (Gumperz 1972:16; Hymes 1972:53-55; Hymes 1974:47-51; Erickson & Schultz 1982:8) or communities of practice. The ensuing discussion of culture focuses on culture as communities of meaning that are situationally produced and organized as well as socially accumulated and shared.

What will be presented in this section is thus a social-constructionist perspective on language which combines a sociolinguistic emphasis on the study of language in social context with a post-structuralist notion of discourse as constitutive of reality. This perspective is highly compatible with and in some ways similar to an ethnomethodological perspective on language as structured practice, but it emphasises to a larger extent the existence of structures of meaning, rather than merely structures of social organization, that are shaped by and shaping interaction.

4.4.2 A Sociolinguistic Perspective on Language

A sociolinguistic perspective on language means that language is considered and studied as closely related to the social context in which it is used and to the actual usage in this context

rather than as an isolated system. One of the founders of modern sociolinguistics is William Labov, who, as part of his PhD research in 1964, did a famous study of the social stratification of English language use within a specific speech community, namely New York City (Labov 1982). In this study he found a structure in the variations of people's language use in relation to language norms and goals of language use (Labov 1982:399). What was new and interesting in Labov's study was the emphasis on the specific circumstances within which language was used, and the way he used his descriptive study of language use within a specific community as the outset for broader discussions of more general problems and issues within linguistic theory and sociological theory such as socio-economic stratification and the relation between normative values and behaviour. Labov thus problematised the tendency for merely descriptive studies of speech communities that had become predominant within and characteristic of sociolinguistic research and emphasized the importance of problem-oriented research (Labov 1982:vii).

While the earlier studies within sociolinguistics had focused on specific language varieties spoken in these communities and groups or the change of language in relation to the mobility of people and peoples, social change and language contact, Labov paved the way for much more locally contextualized studies of language often linked to dynamics of identity and social relations. Hence, Labov initiates a move within sociolinguistics from seeing language as determined by culture, speech communities and social categories and parameters to rather considering such parameters, categories and communities as constituted through language and interaction.

Penelope Eckert describes this change as the three waves within sociolinguistics (Eckert 2005), and she characterizes the type of variation studies launched by Labov in which correlations between linguistic variables and various social categories were examined as the first of these waves. This work, according to Eckert, gave rise to a second wave of studies within sociolinguistics in which the underlying patterns of these social categories were examined by means of ethnographic studies of locally defined communities and populations (Eckert 2005:1). The waves described by Eckert are not to be understood as chronological, and as an example of this she mentions how Labov's study of Martha's Vineyard from 1963 was a landmark example of the studies typical of the second wave even though this study predates the first wave (Eckert 2005:5). In this study Labov showed that locals used specific language variables as resources in an ideological struggle taking place between the fishermen and the

non-fishermen over the situation of the island (Ibid.). Other types of studies that Eckert affiliates with this second wave are Lesley Milroy's study of working class communities in Belfast (Milroy 1980) in which she showed the importance of social networks as a norm-enforcing power, and Eckert's own study of adolescents in Detroit, in which she highlighted the relation between language styles and peer-group affiliations (Eckert 2005:9-15).

There is a great deal of overlap between the interests and methods of study of these second wave sociolinguists and the researchers working within the fields of ethnography of speaking and linguistic anthropology more generally. As the study by Labov, Milroy and Eckert, the work by Hymes (Hymes 1964; Hymes 1972; Hymes 1974) and Gumperz (Gumperz 1962; Gumperz 1972), but also people such as Michael Moerman (Moerman 1988) and William Hanks (Hanks 1990), combine ethnographic fieldwork and the study of language use within specific communities such as the Lue in Thailand or the Maya in Mexico and in relation to specific practices and events occurring in such communities. The main difference between these two strands of research is related to their different academic roots, namely dialectology and anthropology, which means that the former is engaged with 'local' communities while the latter studied 'foreign' communities and languages, but the notion of language informing their work and the methodologies used to carry it out were to a great extent similar, which is apparent from the following description by Hymes:

The ethnography of speaking is concerned with the situations and uses, the patterns and functions, of speaking as an activity in its own right. (Hymes 1971:16)

Diminishing the gap between the two areas of research is the fact that Gumperz and Hymes' work and the notion of speech community have since had an immense impact within sociolinguistics and interactional sociolinguistics, which is visible in the work of researchers like for example Scollon and Scollon and Deborah Tannen within an American context and the work of Celia Roberts, Srikant Sarangi and Ben Rampton within the UK. The importance, but also the problems, of the notion of speech community will be elaborated in section 4.5.4.

What was so valuable about the perspective on language offered by the ethnography of speaking tradition was the fact that language use was studied and described in relation to the community of study rather than a specific linguistic code. If various codes, languages and dialects were used within the context studied they were considered as part of the speech economy of that context rather than deviations from a certain language. This makes the ethnographic method of analysing speech and language use particularly useful for the study of

intercultural encounters or diverse cultural and linguistic settings, since “...*this approach breaks at the outset with a one language-one culture image.*” (Hymes 1971:23) Another central contribution of ethnography of speaking is the emphasis on characterizing language use in relation to events and activities that it could be considered part of and categories like ‘speech event’ and ‘speech situation’ have since been widely used in descriptions of language use that focus on the speakers’ orientations to and understandings of the contexts in which it is used (see section 2.2 for a further description and application of these notions).

The third wave that Eckert describes, and which is the primary source of inspiration for the approach to language use taken in this dissertation, is the type of studies where language use is examined as a resource for the construction of identities and social meanings (Eckert 2005), which in a way turns the approach to social categories found in the first wave of studies upside down. Viewed from this perspective language is to a larger extent considered a practice rather than a system, and the recognisability and structure of language and language use is considered the product of accumulated and repeated practice rather than the basis of that practice. Or as Eckert states:

Peter Ladefoged was arguing last night that **a language** is an institution. I am arguing that **language** is a practice that unfolds with respect to that institution. And it is the accumulation of practice that produces and reproduces that institution. The connection between the individual speaker’s competence on the one hand, and the institution on the other, therefore, lies in the layering of communities from the individual speaker’s most intimate contacts to the imagined community that is the English speaking world (Eckert 2005:16 (Emphasis in original)).

What is clear from this quote is the emphasis within this type of studies on how local practices of language are at once constitutive of and embedded in various different communities and contexts, and the perceived need to examine and describe this complicated web of relations as part of the sociolinguistic endeavour. This is a challenge that Eckert herself engages with in the previously mentioned study of the peer-groups ‘Jocks’ and ‘Burnouts’ in Detroit, and in this way her work may also, like Labov’s, be characterized in relation to more than one ‘wave’.

The sociolinguistic perspective of language adapted in this dissertation is very much the one advocated by Eckert, i.e. one emphasizing language as practice and conceptualizing the relation between language use, and social categories and parameters as one characterized by the former shaping and constituting the latter rather than the other way around. Although this notion of language as practice recognizes that the understanding of language is dependent on

language structure, convention and norms, it focuses on capturing the processual dimension of conventionalization rather than on describing the convention and structure as such. As Eckert formulates it in relation to specific language styles:

Stylistic practice involves a process of bricolage (Hebdige 1984), by which people combine a range of existing resources to construct new meanings or new twists on old meanings. It involves adapting linguistic variables available out in the larger world to the construction of social meaning on a local level. But the use of these variables requires that they have some general conventional meaning, which can be vivified in the particular style. Rather than talking about convention, I prefer to talk about conventionalization. Inasmuch as language is a practice, it involves the continual making and remaking of convention (Eckert 2005:24).

The perspective on language advocated in this dissertation is inspired by a poststructuralist emphasis on the process, hybridity and fluidity of language and places, the individual rather than social categories, groups or speech communities at the centre of language practice. The individual is not so much considered to be determined by language, but rather to be a user and engineer of language.

While I share the overall notion of language dominant in recent sociolinguistic work such as Eckert's, the focus of this study differs from that of most sociolinguists, including Eckert. While I look at the interrelation of language and social action, my overall interest is social action rather than language and language variation as such. The object of study in this dissertation is more in line with social-constructionist and ethnomethodological strands within sociology, namely the social construction of meaning rather than language use as a social phenomenon. Sociolinguists and interactional sociolinguists are fundamentally interested in how linguistic diversity and linguistic change is a result of social behaviour and social change and in how language phenomena such as register-shifting, code-shifting and style are used as resources for signalling attitudes and social identities. As formulated by Gumperz:

When studied in sufficient detail, with field methods designed to elicit speech in significant contexts, all speech communities are linguistically diverse and it can be shown that this diversity serves important communicative functions in signalling interspeaker attitudes and in providing information about speakers' social identities. (Gumperz 1972:13)

I am not so much interested in documenting or describing linguistic diversity or change through showing how language is a resource of communication used to signal social identities and attitudes. Rather, I am interested in documenting and describing the processes in which

language is used a resource for constructing attitudes, identities and the social world as such, and in how such constructions are shaped and influenced by structures of meaning, ideology and the social world. Attitudes and identities are not something belonging to or residing in the individual that is reflected and communicated through language, rather it is a product of social interaction.

4.4.3 A Poststructuralist Perspective on Discourse

There are some similarities, and certainly great compatibility, between the newest developments and approaches to language within sociolinguistics and recent developments within linguistics and semiotics of a poststructuralist notion of discourse. The term poststructuralism describes a movement within not only linguistics and semiotics, but also within the social sciences away from absolute notions of language, culture, identity and self and towards a more dynamic approach to these phenomena as products of meaning-making processes. Opting for a specific rather than a general description, I will present the poststructuralist development within semiology as represented by Jacques Derrida. I will also include an approach to discourse in interaction which is inspired by these developments and represented by the work of discursive psychologists Jonathan Potter and Margaret Wetherell.

Jacques Derrida had a significant influence in and beyond the disciplines of linguistics and semiotics, as he in 1968 (Derrida 1972) challenged Ferdinand de Saussure's wide-spread and generally recognized notion of language as a system of relations between signifiers and signifieds by suggesting that language is a process of difference and deferral, or *différance*. While Saussure had described the relationship between signifiers and signifieds as arbitrary, but the meaning of signs as more or less established over time by their difference from other signs within an overall structure of meaning, Derrida described the meaning of signs as the *trace* of other meanings in a constant process of deferral from one signifier to the next through a play of difference (Derrida 2002:59,60). Hereby he challenged the idea that the meaning of a word, or a text could be discovered and described with reference to the system of meaning and language, *langue*, underlying the practice of language, *parole*. Instead he suggested that meaning is always inherently contextual and in flux and that any text or utterance, and the meaning we attach to it, expresses a temporary fixation which conceals the infinite number of alternative meanings. The method of deconstruction, which developed within literary criticism and many corners of social sciences, such as feminist studies, queer theory and postcolonial

studies, consisted of attempts to disclose and reveal these fixations of meaning and the meanings they concealed and made unspoken.

The perspective on language, semiology and interpretation offered by Derrida allows for an analysis of utterances and interactional exchanges that is focused on the temporary fixations of meaning taking place within a specific context and with a specific purpose. In a Derridean perspective meaning arises from an act of putting some potential meanings to the fore, while others are left in the background, and saying one thing involves the silencing of another. Thus, the interpretation of utterances within a poststructuralist framework involves not only discovering the meaning of the utterance or the text as such, but rather what the meaning of the utterance or text does in terms of what versions of reality it makes available and unavailable, what truths it offers and conceals etc.

This perspective on the functions of language and meaning is to some extent similar to Austin's notion of words as deeds, which was later presented as a general speech act theory (Austin 1962). Austin's emphasis on the pragmatic dimensions of language presented an attack on and a challenge to logical positivist approaches to language, and their idea that the meaningfulness of language could be determined by whether statements could be verified or falsified. While the basic premise and foundation of Austin's theory was in this way different from Derrida's, the work of Austin was inspired and fuelled by an objection to the idea of language as an abstract system which merely described, as opposed to shaping, reality (Potter & Wetherell 1987:14-15).

A poststructuralist perspective on language does not imply, however, that meaning is considered as always in flux and established from scratch. As Roland Barthes describes with the notion of myth, some signs, i.e. the totality of signifier and signified, become established as the signifier for something else at a meta-level of language. Barthes formulates this second degree system of semiology in the following way:

Ce qui est signe (c'est-à-dire total associatif d'un concept et d'une image) dans le premier système, devient simple signifiant dans le second (Barthes 1957:221).

What is a sign (that is the association totality between a concept and its image) in the first system, becomes merely signifier in the second (own translation).

The notion of myth, and Barthes' use of it in the analysis of cultural phenomena, has had a major impact on poststructuralist ways of thinking about language, and has been widely applied within Cultural Studies, where it has been used to analyse how culturally and socially

established myths saturate and influence processes of meaning and are used actively in the production of texts in for example advertising (see Hall 1997). As cultural and social individuals we are constantly confronted with and surrounded by a range of cultural symbols that may or may not be part of a conscious act of communication, but which nevertheless influence our interpretation of the world, and constitute a potential resource in the processes of meaning we engage in. One example which is particularly salient and discussed within not only a Danish context is the scarf which is worn by – and more importantly, has come to represent – Muslim women and has become associated with an oppressive, patriarchal culture.

A poststructuralist perspective on language and meaning, inspired by the semiology presented by Barthes and Derrida, thus emphasises meaning as a process embedded in and influenced by a range of different and often contradictory myths or more or less established ‘meaningful truths’ available and established within a specific cultural and social context. This ideological perspective converges in many ways with the notion of common sense offered by Billig and presented in section 3.3.2 and 4.5.7. Although Billig’s linking of cultural common sense and argumentation is based on rhetoric rather than semiology the analytical potential offered is the same, namely the analysis of culturally established and recognizable structures of meaning and discourse through the study of utterances, argumentation and language.

What is problematic about many poststructuralist and semiologic forms of analysis is that they are often far removed from language practices between social individuals and are rather focusing on written or visual texts, which are then interpreted by the researcher and used as the basis for outlining and describing abstract structures of meaning or discourses. The full potential of the processual and dynamic theoretical framework offered is hereby not explored, since the abstracted establishment of structures of meaning over time emphasizes the meanings that are stable or slowly changing rather than the actual process of negotiation and construction of meaning manifested in the actions and orientations of concrete individuals engaged in meaning-production and consumption.

The work of Michel Foucault is a lucid and paramount example of this analytical approach and has inspired other theorists such as Laclau and Mouffe and Ruth Wodak, who also focus on describing large-scale discursive formations over time. While Foucault’s important landmark studies of how the structure and power of discourse shapes our understanding of sexuality and self (Foucault 1978) and influences our structuring and organization of the penitentiary system (Foucault 1977) have had an immense impact on the

social and human sciences, it is a form of analysis that is one step removed from the actual doings and sayings of concrete subjects. As Wetherell and Potter describe in a critique of Foucault's perspective on discourse:

One of the dangers of this view is that the social practices of discourse use often disappear from sight altogether... The study of discourses can thus become something very like the geology of plate tectonics – a patchwork of plates/discourses are understood to be grinding violently together, causing earthquakes and volcanoes, or sometimes sliding silently one underneath the other. Discourses become seen as potent causal agents in their own right, with the processes of interest being the work of one (abstract) discourse on another (abstract) discourse, or the propositions or 'statements' of that discourse working smoothly and automatically to produce objects and subjects (Wetherell & Potter 1992:90).

This does not mean, however, that the notion of discourse as a structuring element of thought and action cannot be applied in more grounded forms of analysis that focus on the micro-level of processes of meaning. The interactional perspective advocated by Potter and Wetherell (Wetherell & Potter 1988; Wetherell & Potter 1992; Wetherell 1998; Wetherell 2005) and proposed in this thesis is applying a poststructuralist perspective on language and the notion of discourse to describe how structures of meaning and culturally established 'truths' are used actively as resources in the production and negotiation of meaning between interlocutors in interaction. Although the notion of discourse is compatible with an interactional approach to the negotiation of meaning, I will refrain from using it in this study and rather use the notion of interpretative repertoire (see section 3.1.1), which in a similar way defines the structures of meaning that are used as resources in interaction. The point of this is to steer free of the conceptual baggage and methodological confusion that surrounds the term discourse and in a way has created its own inescapable structure of meaning, which hinders the potential of its application.

The notion of interpretive repertoire brings attention to the active use of discourse as a shared resource, while discourse to a greater extent highlights the structural qualities of discourse. Thus, the notion of interpretive repertoire is more compatible with the processual and dynamic qualities of a poststructuralist framework that I find useful for the analysis of language-in-interaction. Furthermore the term repertoire highlights that the structures of meaning that any given individual has access to and uses in interaction are a generated outcome of a history of participation and practice in a range of different contexts and

communities. This resonates with the sociolinguistic notion of language as contextual, which is made slightly more concrete, but also potentially problematic by notion of speech community.

The notion of repertoires highlights the historic dimension of meaning-making, the fact that face-to-face interactions are not situated in a void in time and space but are made possible by previous interpretations, interactions and negotiations of meaning. It describes the more or less established linguistic, discursive and ideological structures that the individual uses as cultural resources in interaction. In a similar vein, Gumperz uses the term verbal repertoire in 1964 to describe “*the totality of linguistic forms regularly employed in the course of socially significant interaction.*” (Gumperz 1964:137), and emphasizes that the verbal repertoires supplies the resources for accepted and recognizable ways of speaking and communicating from which a speaker can chose in accordance with the meaning they want to convey (Gumperz 1964:137-138).

What is important to note about Gumperz use of the term verbal repertoire, and later linguistic repertoire (Gumperz 1972:20), is that he sees the linguistic repertoire as corresponding to a specific speech community, which is the unit of analysis developed within Ethnography of Speaking as a substitute for broader linguistic or cultural units or groups (Gumperz & Hymes 1972)³⁰. Gumperz in this way studies linguistic or verbal repertoires by identifying a speech community, such as the Khalapur community in India and the Hemnesberget community in Norway, and by describing the structure of the repertoire available to the members of these communities as manifested in talk-in-interaction (Gumperz 1964).

In the same way that a differential and absolute notion of culture as separately and comparatively definable entities is untenable in a globalized world, the notion of speech community and linguistic repertoire as defined by Gumperz and Hymes becomes problematic when considering the many communities that most people are members of today. However the notion of repertoires as clusters of linguistic and social resources employed by the individual for a specific purpose is useful to describe individual choice and behaviour as a result of a selection between a range of possibilities defined by previous practices and interactions.

As described by Bakhtin, words and meaning always reflects both previous and future meanings, and are hereby fundamentally contextual, historical, ideological and not least

³⁰ See chapter 5.5 for further explanation and discussion of the concept speech community

ambiguous. The individual utterance can therefore be used as a point of departure for the disclosure of this contextuality

The authentic environment of an utterance, the environment in which it lives and takes shape, is dialogized heteroglossia, anonymous and social as language, but simultaneously concrete, filled with specific content and accented as an individual utterance. (Holquist 1981:272)

When utterances are considered in relation to a context of meaning, history and ideology, the implication is that people via their life history and background have access to certain meanings and interpretative repertoires rather than others. Where discursive psychology thus claims to reject the idea that external factors such as culture, race, personality and cognition determine the individual, it may be argued that they insert a new determining factor instead, namely discourses, ideologies and interpretative repertoires. But the question is whether the notion of discourse, ideology, and specifically interpretative repertoires, presents new analytical possibilities. As argued previously, a data-driven discursive reading opens up possibilities to describe contextual relations, not based on a priori understandings of the participants' culture and identity, but rather on the resources, interpretative and linguistic, that they bring into play.

A final theoretical context in which the notion of repertoire has been discussed should be mentioned, namely the context of sociocultural theories of learning where the notion of repertoire is closely linked to ideas about learning as participation in communities of practice. Lave and Wenger use the term *shared repertoires* to describe resources for negotiating meaning created over time by the joint pursuit of an enterprise (Wenger 1999:82). Whereas the notion of repertoire employed by Potter and Wetherell is strictly discursive and semiotic, the notion used by Wenger includes routines, words, tools, ways of doing things, stories, gestures, symbols, genres, actions, and concepts, or as she says both reificative and participative aspects (Wenger 1999:83). The repertoire, according to Wenger, has two characteristics that make it available as a resource for the negotiation of meaning; first of all it reflects a history of mutual engagement, and secondly it remains inherently ambiguous.

This notion of repertoire summarizes or unites the notion of linguistic repertoire and the notion of interpretative repertoire, since it combines the former's emphasis on repertoires as a product of a history of interaction and co-existence with the latter's emphasis on repertoires as clusters of meaning that are inevitably ambiguous, contestable and in flux.

I will, as described in chapter 3.1.1, use the notion of interpretative repertoires as proposed by Potter & Wetherell, namely as an analytic unit that can be used to situate the meaning of an utterance in a broader cultural, historical, ideological, linguistic and social context than the local conversational context. This situating is based on the understanding implicit in the notion of linguistic, interpretative and shared repertoire. According to this perspective, all construction, interpretation and negotiation of meaning is informed by the previous participation of any given interlocutor in other interactional, linguistic and cultural contexts of practice and the meaning produced in and attributed to these contexts. These previous contexts of practice should not be established a priori by attributing the participants to specific groups and defining them in terms of social categories such as gender, culture and ethnicity, but rather by the micro-analysis of talk-in-interaction that seeks to establish the links to a broader context by inquiring into the argumentative threads of an interaction, the logic behind specific utterances and the history of meaning which make meaning-making and negotiation of meaning possible (Wetherell 1998:402-405).

4.4.4 Speech Communities

The notion of speech community adds another dimension to the conceptualization of culture as shared communities of meaning than interpretative dimension highlighted by the notion of repertoire, since it accentuates in a more concrete way the boundaries of such communities. As mentioned previously, it was used by Labov to describe New York as a structural unit constituted by the shared linguistic norms of its inhabitants, manifested in the pattern of variation in their language use (Labov 1982:5, 202,282). As Labov summarizes:

Our view is that New York City is a single speech community, united by a common set of evaluative norms, though divergent in the application of these norms (Labov 1982:355).

This notion of speech community expressed an idea that is in some ways similar to that expressed by discourse analysts, namely that the shared and continued interaction of people within a given context over time, creates a shared understanding of the meaning of a specific language use, and that this shared understanding can be discovered and described through patterns in discourse and language use.

The notion of speech community was later used by Dell Hymes in 1974 as a social unit of analysis, and it has since been widely used and recognized in this way within the

ethnography of speaking, sociolinguistics and interactional sociolinguistics (Gumperz 1972:16; Hymes 1972:53-55; Erickson & Schultz 1982:8). Based on a definition by Gumperz (1962:30-32) of linguistic communities, Hymes defines 'community' as "...a local unit, characterized for its members by common locality and primary interaction (Hymes 1974:51). Hymes further defines speech community in the following way:

A speech community is defined, then, tautologically but radically, as a community sharing knowledge of rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech. Such sharing comprises knowledge of at least one form of speech, and knowledge also of its patterns of use (Ibid.).

The term has been used widely to explain and describe some of the differences and similarities in communicative behaviour and inference that were observed and documented by researchers such as John Gumperz in relation to studies of intercultural communication. The analytical endeavour enabling such explanations was however the detailed study and documentation of the various characteristics and boundaries of the different speech communities, and this constituted the main objective and practice of the ethnography of speaking. In the following quote by Gumperz, it is clear how this kind of research was in many ways a reflection and extension of the research on and characterization of various cultures taking place within anthropology for decades:

To the extent that speakers share knowledge of the communicative constraints and options governing a significant number of social situations, they can be said to be members of the same speech community. Since such shared knowledge depends on intensity of contact and on communication networks, speech community boundaries tend to coincide with wider social units, such as countries, tribes, religious or ethnic groupings. But this relationship is by no means a one to one relationship... The existence of shared values and of regular communication patterns requires empirical investigation (Gumperz 1972:16).

The goal was the discovery and documentation of 'shared values' and 'regular communication patterns' within different speech communities, and these discoveries were then used as the basis of studies of intercultural communication (Hymes 1974). As an example of this type of work, Gumperz did a study on the differences in values and communicative behaviour of Native Americans and white Americans in the California area and how these differences affected the court proceedings and ultimately the conviction of a young Native American boy, who was charged with conspiracy and murder of a policeman (Gumperz 2001).

Gumperz describes how the young Native Americans involved in the incident were influenced by the Native American speech community that they were part of despite their many years of living among white Americans, and how this influence manifested itself in not only the communicative behaviour during and after the incident, but in their involvement with ritual and social activities specific to Native Americans. This behaviour and these practices were misunderstood by the witnesses and the judges as conspirational and conspicuous, but were later examined by Gumperz and others and found to be related to the cultural and linguistic background of the convicted.

This study illustrates the anthropologically inspired methodology of the researchers working within the tradition of ethnography of speaking and the function and use of the notion of speech community, but it also illustrates one of the central problems with the term, namely the problem of defining the borders and range of a speech community. The young Native Americans had, as mentioned, lived among and with white Americans their whole life, went to regular High Schools and had white American friends, but were nevertheless found to be influenced by their participation in and membership of the Native American speech community.

The problem with the term is, in other words, a problem of membership. When does the membership of an individual in a specific speech community begin and end, and what level of involvement with this speech community qualifies for membership? Furthermore, given the complexity of many people's ethnic, linguistic and cultural background in a globalized world characterized by mobility, how does one separate the influence of various memberships in the study of communicative or social behaviour and attribute this behaviour to a specific membership. Without such separation, the term speech community is useless not only as a descriptive term for specific practices, but as an explanatory term in studies of intercultural communication and miscommunication. Hymes acknowledges the problematic nature of the notion of community in the following quote:

Obviously membership in a community depends upon criteria which in the given case may not even saliently involve language and speaking, as when birthright is considered indelible. The analysis of such criteria is beyond our scope here – in other words, I duck it, except to acknowledge the problem, and to acknowledge the difficulty of the notion of community itself (Hymes 1974:51).

The notion of speech community is useful in addressing and attempting to describe the way that language practices, norms and ideologies are influenced by and to some extent specific to

groupings within society at large. This raises awareness of the hegemony of linguistic practices and norms shared and represented by majority groups and the potential problems and barriers of communication that this hegemony presents for members of various minority groups. However, the term is problematic; first of all because of the issue of membership, and secondly because it can be potentially misleading in providing too simple explanations for specific language behaviour. The language behaviour of individuals is influenced by a multitude of contextual factors besides speech community membership and, as pointed out by conversation analysts, by immediate interactional circumstances such as the speech situation, the speech event and the participation framework (see section 2.2).

As for the problem with the term community, an important attempt has been made by psychologists Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger to describe communities in relation to specific practices. To some extent, specific practices constitute a more concrete criterion of membership than the ones described by Hymes and Gumperz. Moreover, Lave and Wenger's conception of membership simultaneously acknowledges the fact that specific practices can be developed from and anchored to communities that are smaller in size and less culturally related than those described by the term speech community.

4.4.5 Communities of Practice

The notion of communities of practice was developed by Lave and Wenger in relation to a notion of learning as situated in and related to practice. Lave and Wenger challenge traditional conceptions of learning as internalization, which is central in the work of Vygotsky. Although inspired by the idea that learning is closely linked to social interaction, they problematise the dichotomization of an inside and an outside, which follows from some of the interpretations of Vygotsky. Rather than perceiving of learning as a process of making the external social world internal, Lave and Wenger emphasize learning as the process of 'increasing participation in communities of practice' and a process of evolving and transforming social relations (Lave & Wenger 1991:49-50).

The notion of community of practice proposed by Lave and Wenger is in, other words, not only emphasizing that a community is always evolving around a specific set of practices, but it is also highlighting that the membership of such a community is a process, and that an individual can be a more or less fully and equally participating member. This notion is useful in the analysis of face-to-face interactions between native speakers and non-native speakers of Danish, where the non-native speakers are situated between or constitute a link between (at

least) two communities of practice, namely the one represented by their own language group and the one represented by Danish speakers. It highlights that being a second-language Danish speaker is not only a matter of having or not having specific skills or competences, but also, and perhaps more so, a matter of being more or less fully a member or participant in various contexts and communities of practice. As formulated by Lave & Wenger:

Activities, tasks, functions, and understandings do not exist in isolation; they are part of broader systems of relations in which they have meaning. These systems of relations arise out of and are reproduced and developed within social communities, which are in part systems of relations among persons. (Lave & Wenger 1991:53)

In this sense, Lave and Wenger furthermore highlight the fact that the language behaviour, practice and competence of participants in interaction is not reducible to any given cultural, ethnic or social group membership, but must rather be seen in relation to a more complex history of communicative practice and interaction within and across a range of different communities of which the speaker is a more or less fully integrated member. This brings into focus the individual's relation to and participation in practices and contexts related to the job-counselling program, the language school, as well as other contexts that s/he comes into contact with during his or her everyday life. From this perspective, all these contexts of practice, along with the actual speech situation examined, are sites of potential exclusion or inclusion into a range of communities of practice and can be examined in terms of how and to what extent it enables and affords increased and equal participation.

Whereas the notion of speech community defines and reduces the behaviour and identity of the individual in relation to one specific group, Lave and Wenger's notion of community of practice highlights the various relations and contexts that the individual participates in, and the way that the individuals competences and behaviour are influenced by this complex history of relations. They consider being a member of a community of practice a two-way process of defining and being defined by a system of relations:

The person is defined by as well as defines these relations. Learning thus implies becoming a different person with respect to the possibilities enabled by these systems of relations. To ignore this aspect of learning is to overlook the fact that learning involves the construction of identities. (Lave & Wenger 1991:53)

The perspective offered by Lave and Wenger is, in other words, one that links behaviour and language use with participation within a specific community of practice and again links this process to processes of identity. The notion of identity used by Lave and Wenger describes,

like their notion of learning, a process of long-term evolving and participation in relations and communities of practice. This understanding of identity challenges traditional understandings of self and identity as an accumulated core essence of a person's being by emphasizing identity as a relationally produced and maintained phenomenon. However, the idea of identity and self as something carried across situations remains, and throughout their work the idea of identity as something 'gained' appear (Wenger 1999:76). An idea challenged by psychologists focusing on language and interaction and by Conversation Analysts (Potter & Wetherell 1987; Edwards & Potter 1992; Billig 1996; Antaki & Widdicombe 1998a). In these interactional approaches to identity, which is the one I will be advocating, identity is rather something which is produced and made relevant within each individual encounter by the context and the participants interacting. However, this does not imply that I reduce the individual to an interactional product. As described, I conceptualize the knowledge, language and behaviour of the individual to be informed by a history of practice in previous contexts and interactions, which generates sharedness with other people. Processes of membership categorization, which is the approach to processes of identity proposed in this thesis, are informed by and constitutive of this sharedness.

While the notion of language, as well as the notion of learning and identity, applied in this dissertation is inspired by this emphasis on social practice, communities of practice and learning as a process of evolving and transforming systems of relations, I approach these processes in, on the one hand, an even more locally situated manner than Lave and Wenger, and on the other, a way that extends further. Rather than looking at language behaviour and practice in relation to a specific community of practice such as a work-place, I focus on a the practice within a specific interactional context, which is defined and oriented to in particular ways by the participants and hereby related to other, and larger, contexts, communities of practice, speech communities. Lave and Wenger describe language practice and learning in relation to a community of practice whose continuity and coherence is formed by mutual engagement, joint enterprise and shared repertoire (Wenger 1999:73). But this notion of community does not apply to the situation of the internship interview, which can be said to consist of practices taking place in or belonging to various other communities of practice and contexts such as the job-counselling program, the municipal social service, the language school etc. The identities and behaviour of the participants are shaped by their orientations towards

these and other communities of practice and speech communities, but cannot be meaningfully attributed to any single one of them.

The internship interviews that comprise my data illustrates how various communities of practice are brought into play, but my data may also be thought of as locally produced communities of practice shaped around, not a joint engagement in the meaning of longer work-related communities, but rather temporary joint activities and negotiations of meaning. While the individual is surely able to construct and produce coherency and continuity in its own narrative of self (Gergen 1994), this continuity is only available and describable for the researcher as a construct of the individual engaging in interaction, and this is the way in which the relation between language practice, identity and community of practice will be considered here.

In comparison with the notion of speech community, which as mentioned refers to a larger community of shared linguistic norms, the notion of community of practice can be used to refer to a smaller community shaped around a specific joint activity or engagement such as a language centre or a work-place. But like the term speech community, it is most useful in a study of specific interactions as an analytic unit derived from the study of patterns of language use and discourse, rather than as a descriptive term used to explain language behaviour or language learning. Since the purpose in this thesis is not to describe learning or language use in relation to a specific community of practice, but rather to describe a specific practice and how it is influenced by various contexts and contextualisations, the notion of communities of practice will not be explored empirically, but will merely be used to refer to an aspect of the participants' individual history of participation, which provides the resources for language in interaction and can be described as manifested here.

The discussion of the structural and routinised aspects of language and language use has so taken us from the very abstract perspective of poststructuralist linguistics and semiology to the sociolinguistic perspective of language norms shared within speech communities, and finally to the relation between language use, learning and identity within more specific communities of practice.

The final perspective which informs the notion of language offered in this study of internship interviews is the historic-dialectic perspective offered by Mihail Bakhtin and V.N. Vološinov, which in some ways brings us back to a more abstract discussion of the properties of language, but in other ways represents a perspective which links processes of meaning to

interaction, communication and dialogue and imbue these processes with an ideological dimension.

The notion of dialogicality combines an emphasis on meaning as locally constructed and continuously negotiable with a perspective on the way in which every utterance and word is embedded in and influenced by a broader cultural, historical and ideological context. This perspective can in many ways be said to not only be compatible with, but to link the other perspectives and notions hitherto described.

4.4.6 A Historic-Dialectic Perspective on Language

The philosophy of language presented by Vološinov has been closely affiliated with the writings of Mihail Bakhtin and indeed the actual authorship of the writings of Vološinov have been questioned and debated since 1973, when the Soviet semiotician and linguist V.V. Ivanov declared that some of the writings of Medvedev and Vološinov were in fact written by Bakhtin (Vološinov 1973:ix). While there has been some discussion on the differences between the two with relation to degree of linguistic technicality and extent of Marxist affiliation, the fact remains that many of the ideas presented by them individually, such as the linking of ideology and meaning and the notion of meaning as a product of social interaction and dialogue, are highly similar and can be presented as, at least, a similar line of thought. The perspective on language presented in this section thus draws on Vološinov as well as Bakhtin without conflating the two and not engaging in the discussion of doing so.

One of the central veins of thought in the writings of Vološinov is the idea that signs in the process of meaning-construction can acquire an ideological dimension, which is an idea that is similar to, although predating it, the previously presented notion of myth presented by Barthes. Vološinov describes this link in the following way:

A sign does not simply exist as a part of a reality – it reflects and refracts another reality. Therefore, it may distort that reality or be true to it, or may perceive it from a special point of view, and so forth. Every sign is subject to the criteria of ideological evaluation (i.e., whether it is true, false, correct, fair, good, etc.). The domain of ideology coincides with the domain of signs. They equate with one another. Wherever a sign is present, ideology is present, too. *Everything ideological processes semiotic value* (Vološinov 1973:10).

Vološinov's ideas about the ideological properties of signs were inspired on the one hand by Saussure, and on the other, by Marxist thinking, though he problematises both: The former for the separation of langue and parole and the conceptual separation of synchrony and diachrony

(Matejka & I.R.Titunik 1973:2). The latter for associating ideology with merely the psychological rather than the linguistic domain (Vološinov 1973:13) as well as for having an understanding of ideology which is pre-dialectical and mechanistically causal (Vološinov 1929:xiv; Vološinov 1973:17-18). Vološinov's conceptualization of language, meaning and ideology is far more processually oriented and less structuralist than Saussurean and Marxist thinking, and he can almost be said to pre-empt the poststructuralist thinking that were to emerge later with the work of among others Derrida. Vološinov seeks to redefine the classic Marxist formulation of the relation between basis and superstructure as a more dialectic relation involving a range of different domains and contexts that the semiotic-ideological processes are embedded in. Vološinov proposes that we use the word, *slovo*, as it is uttered and interpreted in context as a point of entry into processes of change evolving from the basis to the superstructure:

The word is implicated in literally each and every act or contact between people – in collaboration on the job, in ideological exchanges, in the chance contacts of ordinary life, in political relationships, and so on. Countless ideological threads running through all areas of social intercourse register effect in the word. It stands to reason, then, that the words is the most sensitive *index of social changes*, and what is more, of changes still in the process of growth, still without definitive shape and not as yet accommodated into already regularized and fully defined ideological systems. The word is the medium in which occur the slow quantitative accretions of those changes which have not yet achieved the status of a new ideological quality, not yet produced a new and fully-fledged ideological form. The word has the capacity to register all the transitory, delicate, momentary phases of social change (Vološinov 1973:19).

The idea of using the word or utterances in interaction as a point of entry into the historical and ideological threads that permeate and connect all aspects and contexts of social life is a useful tool for understanding how the processes of meaning within one interaction, such as the internship interview, are embedded in an influenced by a broader context of interactions and meanings. This idea is in some way similar to that proposed by Margaret Wetherell, when she, as a reply to Schegloff's criticism of discourse analysis, advocates the usefulness of a poststructuralist perspective in the study of discourse. In brief, her argument reads that the poststructuralist perspective allows for an understanding of the 'argumentative threads' or the 'institutionalized forms of intelligibility' (Wetherell 1998:22-25) which enable us to account fully for 'why that now'.

The problem with Vološinov's conceptualization of the relation between ideology and language is, however, that he sees language as merely a symptom of ideological change, and that he identifies the origin of this change in the basis. In other words, he makes a clear distinction between that which exists, i.e. that which belongs to the basis and is controlled by economic relations, and that which belongs to the realm of ideology, and he sees dynamic of change as originating on in the former and having mere repercussions in the latter. A poststructuralist perspective, a radical one at least, on the other hand, sees the discursive realm as the only 'real' existence and all other entities as products of discourse.

In my opinion both perspectives are too dedicated to the aim of identifying a specific site of change and too keen to give one realm ontological priority over the other. Rather the process of social and linguistic change can be seen as a dialectic relationship between production, negotiation, reification and challenge of all things, concepts and understandings that we consider to be existing phenomena. The discussion of what is 'real' and what is 'discursive' has been widespread for some years now in relation to social-constructionism and although these discussion is of principal importance, they are often used as a means of polemic positioning and unconstructive trench-digging rather than an attempt to conceptualize the relation between non-discursive and discursive aspects of reality. I will not engage in these discussions at great length in this dissertation, but merely present my own pragmatic positioning in between the position represented by Vološinov and a radical poststructuralist position often associated with researchers such as Michel Foucault.

The position I take is pragmatic in the sense that although my perspective on internship interviews and reality in general is predominantly discursive, this does not mean that I do not recognize the existence of a social and physical reality consisting of phenomena that are normally considered non-discursive, such as mountains, schools, emotions, crime etc., but that I focus on the way in which such phenomena are given meaning. Although a mountain is a very concrete thing when you climb it, the meaning of that mountain varies for each and every individual in relation to the function it has in a specific situation and a specific context and it is the negotiation of these various meanings, which is the focus of my interest, not the ontological reality of the mountain as such. This position is very similar to the one advocated by social psychologist Kenneth Gergen, who replies in the following way to the realist objection often made against the constructionist position:

Constructionism makes no denial concerning explosions, poverty, death, or “the world out there” more generally. Neither does it make any affirmation. As I have noted, constructionism is ontologically mute. Whatever is, simply is. There is no foundational description to be made about and “out there” as opposed to an “in here”, about experience or material. Once we attempt to articulate “what there is”, however, we enter the world of discourse. At that moment the process of construction commences, and this effort is inextricably woven into processes of social interchange and into history and culture (Gergen 1994:72).

What Gergen proposes here, and what is suggested in relation to a notion of culture in this chapter is that reality as we know it, perceive it and understand it is constituted in processes of language and interaction and this constitution is influenced by history and culture.

This position affords an analytical perspective which grants primary status to the processes of meaning in which reality is constituted in various ways, while recognizing the way such constitutive processes are embedded in a cultural and historical context and involve the reference to social, physical and emotional phenomena that have achieved the status of ‘reality’ within that context. As an example, the fact that the internship candidates are unemployed and thus tied in with the Danish welfare system and its regulations is very much ‘real’ for the candidate and the job-consultant, since it is one of the main reasons for the internship interview to occur in the first place. But the ‘reality’ of this, and the fact that this status of unemployment, within a Danish context, almost naturally leads to job-counselling and an internship is intimately linked with institutionalized and ideological understandings of unemployment, the nation state, the welfare system, the individual’s relation to society etc. Some of these understandings are negotiated, produced, and reiterated within the actual encounter and contribute to constructing the ‘reality’ of the candidates situation in specific ways.

The perspective on language and the relation between language and ideology presented in this dissertation varies, in other words, from that of Vološinov in the sense that the dialectical process of change is conceptualized as originating in the non-discursive as well as in the discursive realm, and that the non-discursive realm, or the realm of ‘existence’ is not considered as separate or ontologically privileged in relation to the discursive. This does not, however, challenge Vološinov’s idea that one can study social and ideological change by studying the word, or talk-in-interaction, but rather extends the potential of this idea in the sense that the discursive and interactional realm is not only seen as the symptom or product of change, but as one of the sites in which this change occurs.

Bakhtin's idea of dialogicality is very similar to Vološinov's idea of the word as a symptom and product of a social, historical and ideological context, although Bakhtin is not equally engaged with Marxist thinking. The notion of dialogicality was developed by Bakhtin in relation to a theory of the novel as a site of plurivocality or heteroglossia, i.e. the coming together and interrelatedness of many voices within a single novel, which is exemplified with the writings of the Russian writer Dostojevski. The notion of dialogicality is, however, not limited to a specific property of a type of Russian writing, but is extended to a general notion of language, or more specifically, a notion of the word as related to and carrying with it the meaning of other words within a given cultural context and thereby referring back to a general history of meaning. Bakhtin uses the term *cuzoe slovo*, or the alien word, in the sense foreign or other, to refer to the range of potential meanings residing in every utterance and word and which makes the process of meaning fundamentally heteroglossic and characterized by a tension between the centrifugal and the centripetal forces of language (Bakhtin 1981:276). As formulated by Bakhtin:

Every concrete utterance of a speaking subject serves as a point where centrifugal and centripetal forces are brought to bear. The processes of centralization and decentralization, of unification and disunification, intersect in the utterance; the utterance not only answers the requirements of its own language as an individualized embodiment of a speech act, but it answers the requirements of heteroglossia as well; it is in fact an active participant in such speech diversity. And this active participation of every utterance in living heteroglossia determines the linguistic profile and style of the utterance to no less a degree than its inclusion in any normative-centralizing system of a unitary language. (Bakhtin 1981:272)

What Bakhtin highlights here is how every word and utterance is at once a creation and a recreation of language and meaning, and thus contributes to the diversification and the unification of language. Words and utterances are in this way both products of a past and a future history of language. The usefulness of the perspective offered by both Vološinov and Bakhtin is not merely in the ideological dimension they offer, but in the focus on the way processes of meaning are always situated not only in an immediate interactional context, but in a larger social, cultural and historical context. Vološinov describes the process of meaning as embedded in the realm of social interaction in the following way, which again represents a challenge to the structural linguistic notion of *langue* and *parole* as separate domains:

Every sign, as we know, is a construct between socially organized persons in the process of their interaction. Therefore, the forms of signs are conditioned above all

by the social organization of the participants involved and also by the immediate conditions of their interaction. When these forms change, so does sign. And it should be one of the tasks of the study of ideologies to trace this social life of the verbal sign (Vološinov 1973:21).

From this quote we again see the unidirectional way in which Vološinov conceptualizes change, i.e. the forms of signs are conditioned by the context. However, processes of change in meanings can alternatively be considered to be a pluridirectional process occurring between, on the one hand signs, words and utterances and on the other social organization and ideology. Such a conceptualization formulates processes of meaning as endless struggles over the reproduction or change of, not only signs, but of their cultural, linguistic, social and historical context. This notion of ideology as at once shaped by and shaping language, thought and interaction is suggested by Michael Billig, who also conceptualizes ideology in a less monolithic manner than Vološinov, which is useful in the study of interaction.

He describes *common sense* and ideology as dilemmatic (Billig 1991) in the sense that they consist of a range of opposing positions and understandings that can be effectuated and used as resources in argumentation depending on the context of the interaction and argumentation:

It is easy to think of common-sense as consisting of the communal wisdom which stamps the thinking of all members of a particular community. However, common-sense may not be a unitary store of folk wisdom, but instead it may provide us with our dilemmas for deliberation and our controversies for argument. The dilemmatic aspect of common-sense, in short, might fill our minds with the controversial things which make much thought and argument possible. (Billig 1996:222)

What Billig highlights here is how the sharedness of meanings and understandings within a given community is not homogenous and unitary, but is rather controversial and dilemmatic. This conceptualization of sharedness formulates an alternative to essentialist and deterministic notions of culture which is dynamic and highlights the ability of the individual to contribute to ideological critique and social change. As Billig states:

The elements of common sense can be used to criticize common sense. In this sense, ideology does not necessarily prevent argumentation, but it can provide the resources for criticism. (Billig 1991:22)

Thus, an ideological perspective on language inspired by the historic dialectic perspective of Bakhtin and Vološinov and the rhetorical perspective of Michael Billig offers a way of

explaining how talk-in-interaction is not merely a reflection of more or less established structures of meaning and ideological struggles, but a potential challenge to, or confirmation of, a given social, cultural and linguistic status quo.

4.4.7 An Ideological Perspective on Language

The notion of common sense is, as described in section and 3.3.2 , adapted from Gramsci (1971) and used in an anthropological way as proposed by Discursive Psychologist Michael Billig (1991; 1996) to refer to, not what is sensible, but rather to widespread or shared notions and understandings within a community (Billig 1996:231). When analyzing interactional negotiation and processes of categorization, the notion of common sense can be used to highlight the content dimension of argumentation and verbal interaction (Billig 1996:36). Common sense, in other words, emphasizes what is being talked about, rather than how it is being talked about. This does not imply that common-sense only relates to content, since Billig also states that the link between a speaker (orator) and a hearer (audience) is based on the sharing of argumentative form.

Since the orator and the audience are linked together, oratory must be seen as an irreducibly social activity. At the minimum, this implies that orator and audience must share common argumentative forms. The speaker must use shapes of arguments which are recognizable to the audience (Billig 1996:226).

And further...

The link between the orator and the audience rests upon more than a sharing of argumentative forms. It also comprises a common content. If orators are identifying with their audiences, then they are emphasizing communal links, foremost amongst which are shared values or beliefs. The concept of common-sense (*sensus communis*) might be a helpful one for discussing this communal content. The orator, in identifying with the beliefs of the audience, will be treating the audience as a community bound together by shared opinions...The audience, therefore, will be presumed to possess a common-sense, agreeing that certain positions are commonly sensible whilst others are affronts (Ibid.).

Hence, common sense is useful in relation to definition of culture, since it recognizes the interactional, dynamic, processual aspect of culture. Furthermore it emphasises that culture is not merely manifested in the social, interactional and sequential organization but also in the content, topics, themes, values and beliefs that are formulated and negotiated in interaction.

The notion of *common-sense* is also used within Ethnomethodology (Garfinkel 1967) to refer to the socially sanctioned knowledge of 'members' of society, that is established through

the structuring actions of such members and makes such actions recognisable. As formulated by Garfinkel:

Socially-sanctioned-facts-of-life-in-society-that-any-bona-fide-member-of-the-society-knows depict such matters as the conduct of family life, market organization, distribution of honor, competence, responsibility, goodwill, income, motives among members, frequency, causes of, and remedies for trouble, and the presence of good and evil purposes behind the apparent workings of things. Such socially sanctioned, facts of social life consist of descriptions from the point of view of the collectivity member's interests in the management of his practical affairs. Basing our usage upon the work of Alfred Schutz, we shall call such knowledge of socially organized environments of concerted actions "common sense knowledge of social structures." (Garfinkel 1967:76)

From an ethnomethodological perspective common sense knowledge in this way refers to the shared knowledge within a given, and undefined, collectivity that structures our actions and social conduct. While the notion of common sense presented by Billig emphasizes the shared structures of meaning and understanding, the ethnomethodological perspective on common sense rather emphasizes shared knowledge of social structures and social organization. However, there is a significant overlap in the way that Billig and ethnomethodologists consider processes of categorization to be influenced and informed by common sense. As expressed by ethnomethodologists Hester and Eglin in relation to Membership Categorization Analysis:

MCA directs attention to the locally used, invoked and organized 'presumed common-sense knowledge of social structures' which members are oriented to in the conduct of their everyday affairs... (Hester & Eglin 1997b:3).

What is highlighted by ethnomethodology, as well as Billig's rhetorical form of Discursive Psychology, is that processes of categorization involves the negotiation, reproduction and challenge of commonly shared knowledge of categories, people and social conduct. While ethnomethodologists tend to emphasize and study shared knowledge of social conduct and social organization, Billig emphasizes knowledge of shared meanings and understandings, but the separation of the two is obviously difficult to maintain, and the two perspectives are both closely related and highly compatible. Within ethnomethodology and rhetoric common sense incorporates cultural aspects pertaining to form as well as content, and links it intimately with the negotiations in and of social life.

The concept of common sense can, in other words, be used to refer to the culturally shared and contested knowledge of language, the social order, meanings and understandings,

which is used as a resource for interpreting, establishing and acting in the social world. Common sense also encapsulates the fact that culture is both brought along and brought about and is constantly negotiated, constructed and challenged in social interaction. Billig stresses that common sense is not a homogenous, unitary and absolute system of knowledge, but rather a discursive and ideological framework consisting of contrary positions and opinions, which is continually challenged and changed by people in interaction.

The rhetorical aspects of common-sense suggest that, just as the mind of the orator might be filled with contrary possibilities, so too might common-sense be marked by a contrary nature. It is easy to think of common-sense as consisting of communal wisdom which stamps the thinking of all members of a particular community. However, common-sense may not be a unitary store of folk wisdom, but instead it may provide us with our dilemmas for deliberation and our controversies for argument. The dilemmatic aspect of common-sense, in short, might fill our minds with the controversial things which make much thought and argument possible (Billig 1996:222).

This dilemmatic nature of common sense is clear in the following extract where a common sense assumption about the language situation of immigrants in Denmark is first applied as a resource by EM making the inferential utterance *So you both have to learn Danish*, and is later challenged by CO with the utterance *No he has lived here for many years*.

Extract 28: So You Both Have to Learn Danish? (Repeated extract)

13 EM: Er din mand også fra I:ran, (very thouroughly prec
14 Is your husband also from I:ran
15
16 IN: ja
17 yes
18
19 EM: ja
20 yes
21
22 IN: ja=
23 yes=
24
25 EM: =[.tsk]
26 =[.tsk]
27
28 () [.hja]
29 [.hjyeah]
30
31 EM: Så skal I begge [to lære fdanskf? =
32 So you both have [to learn fdanishf?=
33
34 IN: [han kommer (ja/her)=
35 [he comes (yes/here)=
36
37 EM: =[sk.ha] [()]=
38 =[sk.ha] [()]=
39
40 IN: =[ja] ha ha [ha]=
41 =[yes]ha ha [ha]=
42
43 CO: =[Nej han har]boet her i mange år.
44 =[no he has] lived here for many years
45
46 IN: =[ja::]
47 =[ye::s

Common sense is also useful in highlighting the ideological dimension of culture in the sense that ideology works to make some statements, knowledge and understandings more common-sense and less controversial than others, and to distinguish what is speakable and understandable from that which is not. Common sense thus offers various claims, positions, truths, understandings, but some of these are more negotiable than others, and some cannot be negotiated at all. However, the truth status of understandings and knowledge is not fixed in the sense that what is open to negotiation and can be justified, accounted for and formulated as a matter of dispute can suddenly receive the status of undisputed truth. Similarly, that which has not previously been questioned, and is therefore not easily explained, justified or accounted for can suddenly be opened up as a subject of controversy and opinion (Billig 1996:208). The notion of common sense thus describes the sharedness of understandings and assumptions that inform a given community, and it highlights how sharedness implies heterogeneity, controversies and dilemmas.

4.5 Culture as a Flexible Community of Meaning

It is evident that in order for people to interact and produce meaning, we need to share or at least recognize certain meanings, practices and understandings. However, as John Gumperz argues in relation to language, we cannot make a priori assumptions about such sharedness. Consequently, we should, in relation to the analysis of interaction and processes of meaning, avoid any assumptions about the level of sharedness of the participants or their membership status in relation to various cultures. When analyzing interaction between individuals who do not share a native language, differences in communicative behaviour and competence may seem more pronounced than in contexts where people seem to have more shared communicative resources and backgrounds. On the other hand, the accomplishment and successfulness of such interactions does not merely result from such differences.

Research in native/non-native interaction shows that linguistic competence is at least to some extent cooperatively and interactively constructed (Brown 2003; Fogtman 2007), and lack of lexical or grammatical knowledge is not necessarily relevant in interaction nor necessarily directly related to the outcome of the interaction. Furthermore, as much research on gatekeeping encounters within interactional sociolinguistics shows (Gumperz et al. 1979), the degree of eloquence and fluency of a non-native speaker speaking in his/her second language does not prevent misunderstandings and communication break-downs caused by differences in

inferences made from the use of linguistic and not least paralinguistic signs being used or the from the improper or insufficient integration of discourses (Roberts & Campbell 2005; Roberts & Campbell 2006).

In other words, interpretations of behaviour are equally significant for communication to succeed as is behaviour as such, and such interpretations cannot be assumed to result from any particular cultural membership, but from a complex individual socio-cultural background and a history of participation in a range of different contexts and communities. As Hastrup argues *“Culture is as much a result of individual actions as it is their explanation”* (Hastrup 2004:69; My translation). Consequently, cultures must be described, as they are constituted in processes of meaning and social organization.

As people interact, they continually establish, renew and index the context of understanding relevant to the current actions and activities of the participants, and in this process new boundaries of sharedness and difference are produced alongside the production and negotiation of membership categories. Sarangi and Roberts describe this production of sharedness and communities of relevance as a process of contextualization (Roberts & Sarangi 1999b:25). However, while they consider this process as a communicative phenomenon related to the establishment of interpersonal solidarity or co-membership in Erickson and Schultz’ terms, what is proposed here is rather that contextualization is a micro-dynamic aspect of the interactional processes in which a range of shared communities of meaning, or cultures, are constituted.

The challenge in defining the notion of culture is to capture the wide range of communities of meaning and their flexible, interwoven and dynamic nature, while acknowledging the routinisation, reproduction and reification of specific meanings and practices that produce and uphold such communities. The notion of discourse and interpretative repertoire attempts to account for the more or less established structures of meaning produced and maintained through a shared history of interaction, but discourse analysts often either sidestep the issue of membership altogether or make gross generalizations about the discourse and practices linked to a specific cultural, institutional or historical context.

The notions of speech community and community of practice on the other hand, is often used to describe very specific geographic, ethnic or institutional contexts of understanding and practice. However, this tends to conceal the problematics of boundary making, and the way in which broader structures of sharedness intersect with, surpass and, to some extent, potentially

undermine the specific determinacy of the contexts in focus. The problem, of course, is that the routinisation of practices and the shared structures of meaning are always partially established by the specific constellation of participants within a context of interaction, and partially by the specific context as such and the moment to moment contextualization of this context by the participants.

The internship interview and the language practice and shared understandings of the participants taking part in it are thus partially determined by the structure and framework of the Danish language which is spoken, and by the institutionality of the interaction. It is, however, also influenced by the previous interactional experiences of the participants, and thereby by the various contexts of interaction that they potentially represent and manifest through their language use. Linking a specific language use to a specific speech community, a specific community of practice or even a specific context of practice is, in other words, problematic, if the goal is to define this language use as determined by the context. This does not mean that patterns in a language use cannot be identified and described in relation to the context in which it occurs, if emphasis is put on describing patterns in language use first and the boundary within which this pattern occurs later.

Gumperz method of analysis is an example of this in the sense that just as he makes no assumptions about sharedness, he makes no assumptions about the behaviour of individuals in relation to specific social parameters. He challenges traditional sociolinguistic notions of speech community as a well-defined, isolated entity (Gumperz 1982), and describes how group identity and social identity is a product of interaction which cannot be used as a basis for the analysis of other categories. At the same time, however, he studies inter-cultural communication and to some extent, although inductive in approach, explains communication break-downs with reference to inter-cultural differences in inference and behaviour patterns. This, of course, presumes the existence of certain groupings.

In this chapter I have proposed a conceptualization of culture which can be placed somewhere between a differential and situational notion of culture. Culture has been described as communities of sharedness that are established by the repeated and accumulated social interaction and social organization of individuals – a process inseparable from processes of meaning and discourse. Such communities are formed on many levels and in relation to different contexts of social practice within and across overarching communities such as

nations, civilizations, religions and societies. Consequently, culture can never be reduced to or defined as these large-scale communities.

In the same way that the content of culture is defined and constituted by practice, social interaction and processes of meaning, cultural membership is achieved and produced through repeated social interaction with other people within different contexts of practice. Cultural membership is, however, not only achieved through the production and reproduction of shared meanings, assumptions, values, dilemmas and controversies are produced and reproduced, but through processes of categorization in which people establish communities or groups to which they ascribe themselves and others. Culture is thus considered to be constituted through a two-dimensional process, the production, accumulation and negotiation of sharedness within a community as well as the establishment and negotiation of communities or groups and people's membership of such groups. The two dimensions are closely interrelated, but neither is individually considered to be culture.

Shared meanings and understandings may thus be established or be expressed by two or more individuals without this implying a shared culture. Similarly groups or communities may be established and affiliated with particular individuals who do not share the practices and meanings associated with such communities and/or do not consider themselves as members. Hence, cultural membership is meaningless without cultural sharedness vice versa. Culture implies the constitution of sharedness between individuals together and the definition of sharedness through discursive processes of group establishment and membership categorization, and is not the property, but the achievement of individuals.

The notions of speech community, community of practice, discourse and interpretative repertoire highlight the discursive and semantic dimension of the sharedness that was previously described as one of the central aspects of culture. Furthermore, they contribute to refining and solidifying the idea of culture as communities of sharedness on various levels. The other was culture as a membership produced, oriented to and made relevant by individuals for various more or less strategic purposes in processes of social organization and meaning. As indicated, these two dimensions of culture are distinct yet closely related in the sense that the orientation towards or the establishment of a given cultural membership. In this dissertation the two dimensions will be used as analytic units that are determined through the discovery and description of patterns of language use, rather than structural units used to explain or determine language practice and patterns.

The perspective on language advocated in this dissertation highlights, firstly, the constructive, processual and relational properties of language, and secondly, it engages with what may be characterized as patterns of language use and meaning, and how these can be described in relation to local as well as broader contexts and communities.

The notion of culture as overarching communities related to supra-constructions such as nations, civilizations and societies does not describe, or recognize the heterogeneity of the members of such communities and erases the smaller scale communities of shared knowledge, meanings and practices that people participate in and generate through accumulated and repeated practice. A notion of culture as flexible communities of meaning that inform and are produced in processes of meaning and social interaction encompasses these various levels and scales of sharedness and organization, and this is the definition proposed in this thesis. As Kirsten Hastrup formulates it:

There are many types of communities that we can study as culture. Terms such as organizational culture, management culture, and so on are already a part of language, and it makes good sense to also look at such part-time communities as culture...By studying many types of communities in very different scales one is offered the possibility of handling social differentiation without relapsing into a notion of culture, that organizes the world in separate cultures, that are similar in kind and lie nicely ordered next to each other on the big map, and where every single person can only belong to or have a single culture. (Hastrup 2004:176)

The notion of culture proposed by Hastrup is very similar to the one proposed here, although the emphasis on the discursive dimension of culture or the previously established link between language and culture is slightly less pronounced in her definition. The theoretical and methodological position presented in this thesis quite explicitly highlights the centrality of processes of meaning, and in this sense the notion of culture as shared communities of meaning is similar to the following definition offered by Ulf Hannerz who has an interactionist perspective that, like the perspective offered by Barth, highlights culture as a process between individuals:

As collective systems of meaning, cultures belong primarily to social relationships, and to networks of such relationships. Only indirectly, and without logical necessity, do they belong to places. (Hannerz 1992:39)

The conceptualization of language presented in this chapter accentuates how differences, similarities and sharedness are constituted in the processes of meaning and social organization between individuals with different histories of participation through a range of communities of

meaning. Culture is in this way not considered to be the communities that are brought into an interaction and influence the contribution of the participants and processes of meaning; rather culture is understood as the communities of meaning that are constituted through such processes of meaning. These communities are manifested in patterns of assumptions, interpretations and formulations and in the negotiations over meanings and understandings and categories. Culture is sharedness, but it is a shared illusion of sharedness in the sense that it can never be absolute or defined, since it is inherently contextual and dynamic. As Hastrup argues:

The context is not independent from the text, the interpretation and the very phenomena that are to be placed in context. The context is in other words emergent; it is constituted in and by the interpreters understanding of relevance and boundaries. It is the case for any analytical object that it is an illusion, which is produced and reproduced in the analytical action.(Hastrup 2004:175; my translation)

Hastrup's point here is both methodological and theoretical insofar as she describes culture as an illusion and argues that as such it may be described as communities on various levels, but a community is always embedded in a larger societal context in relation to which the researcher (the interpreter) should be able to legitimize studying them as social communities in their own right.

Following this argument I do not mean to suggest that any social formation may be described as a culture. Here the dimension of culture accentuated by Barth and the perspective of ethnomethodology becomes relevant. An emphasis on cultural membership as something produced and oriented to by the participants thus accentuates the membership categories or cultures relevant and known to the participants. As mentioned previously culture is considered communities of meaning constituted by the production of sharedness and the production of groups and group memberships between individuals in interaction. This means that the researcher's definition and study of something as culture should involve the argumentation for sharedness of meanings, practices and understandings between particular individuals and the demonstration that such sharedness is oriented to and made relevant by such individuals.

While the notion of culture presented here is highly influenced by the discursive and conversation analytical perspective of this thesis, I do not mean to suggest that culture is only meanings and social organizations produced in social interaction. Similarly, I am not proposing that culture can or should only be studied through social interaction or the study of discourse. Although I consider culture to be produced, reproduced and interpreted through language, it

has social, institutional and even physical manifestations that can be studied as distinct, though not separate, from language, discourse and representation. The analysis of culture may thus include objects, physical surroundings and institutions that are a part of everyday life and the social processes of meaning between individuals.

4.6 Methodological Implications and Considerations

The application of the notion of culture in this thesis is not descriptive in the sense of defining and outlining the cultures that each participant can be said to be a member of. Nevertheless, the processes of meaning and social organization that I illuminate in the analysis are ‘cultural’ in the sense that they are linked to and informed by the various communities of meaning that the participants are members of. Some of these are shared and others are not. Although I do not attempt to identify, delineate and describe such communities, their presence and influence is very clear in both the orientations of the participants and in the analysis. In this sense I am analyzing culture and cultural encounters by analyzing processes of meaning and this process involves objects, physical settings and social institutions in the same way as cultural living does. For example, the analysis of an internship interview at an orchard involves visiting the orchard where the internship takes place and walking around the orchard with the participants in the interview. This generates knowledge and an understanding of culturally specific practices and meanings, such as what is meant by ‘our store’ uttered by the employer at the orchard (see section 5.3). During my recordings, informal interviews and introductory research, I have thus gained knowledge of some of the cultural aspects that are not discursive, but are given a specific meaning and relevance by the participants in the various internship interviews. The analytical aim and methodological position of this thesis means that a description of the discursive aspect of culture is given priority to over a more holistic description of the various contexts and communities they involve. Knowledge about other aspects of culture is only included to illuminate the actions and utterances of the participants.

Chapter 5

Gate-Keeping in Internship Interviews – The Establishment, Negotiation and Assessment of Nationality, Religion and Language

5.1 Two Analytical Perspectives: Membership Categorizations and Interpretative Repertoires

The following analysis combines perspectives, tools and concepts from Conversation Analysis and Discursive Psychology in an attempt to capture the dialectic of discourse-in-interaction, i.e. how social individuals and social life structure and are structured by language and discourse. The purpose of combining a CA perspective and a discursive psychological perspective is to grasp the micro dynamics of discourse-in-interaction, and the way that such micro dynamics tie in with and reveal broader structures of discourse that influence our (inter)actions, and our possibilities of constructing ourselves and others and positioning ourselves in social life.

The tools of CA, namely sequential analysis and membership categorization analysis, allow for a description of how nationality, religion and language are made relevant and the different consequences for the future development of the interaction of this. Discursive psychology and the notion of interpretative repertoires, on the other hand, allow for a description of how certain patterns in the construction of nationality, language, and religion constitute structures of meaning that are related to power and ideology. Such structures constitute part of the resources for constructing and negotiating meaning in interaction, and they are an important dimension of membership knowledge and cultural common sense. While CA allows for descriptions of the meanings and categories that are brought about in specific interactions, it does not allow for, or engage with, descriptions of the structures of meanings and understandings which extend beyond the here and now. For this we need a broader perspective on discourse than talk-in-interaction, and not least one which includes perspectives of ideology and power such as the one described in section 3.3.2. The combination of a discursive psychological perspective and a conversation analytical approach supplies such a perspective.

The tools of Conversation Analysis and Membership Categorization Analysis can be used to shed light on how the participants construct, negotiate, interpret and orient to various social categories, meanings and identities and mutually co-construct what the interaction is

about and where it is going. This form of analysis shows how the sequential organization and development is closely tied to the categorical work of the participants, and that in order to describe how nationality, language and religion are made relevant and the consequences of this, both perspectives must be included in a back and forth movement as described by Watson:

“What I am claiming, then, is that interlocutors’ sensible production and monitoring of an utterance and of a series of utterances is both categorical and sequential. Interlocutors’ conjoint orientation to the categorical relevances informs their orientation to the ‘structure’ of utterance and series which in turn inform the categorical relevances.” (Watson 1997:54)

Hence, making certain categories relevant influences the sequential development of the interaction, which again has consequences for the categorical negotiations that follow, which again...and so on. There is, however, yet another dimension of the construction of sense or meaning, which is not considered in sequential CA analysis, and is only tacitly implied in Membership Categorization Analysis, viz. the relation between an interactional here and now and the discourses and ideologies in which this here and now is embedded.

Sequential Conversation Analysis and Membership Categorization Analysis deal with the local establishment of meaning between participants and determine the meaning of each individual utterance by looking at how it is received and responded to by the other participants. In the search for an answer to the question that drives CA, namely ‘why that now’, Conversation Analysts seek to explain social action and organization by continually moving backwards in the interaction, looking at the previous utterances and actions. Within Conversation Analysis the meaning and organization of social action and language are, in other words, pursued through a back and forth movement between what occurs previous to and after an utterance.

In the ensuing analysis, various utterances or extracts will be chosen as starting points to determine how nationality, language and religion are made relevant in the interaction and with what consequences. While such starting points certainly allow a description of how the participants respond to and negotiate the utterances by other participants, it does not enable any explanation of why specific utterances occur and are made relevant in the first place. In order to understand ‘why that now?’, one has to move further back in the interaction since the previous turns constitute the conversational context of this exact utterance in the same way that the utterance itself establishes the conversational context for what is to follow. Although one

can always choose to include a larger extract or go further back in the interaction to look for a sequentially based explanation for a specific utterance or activity, this will only give half an answer at best, and at worst provide no answer at all. It may reveal that a specific topic or category such as nationality is made relevant in relation to a discussion of experience or problems at the workplace, which allows us to establish that the participants orient to and construct a relation between, nationality and experience. However, it does not tell us anything in itself about why that relation is recognized and treated as meaningful. Not only can this question not be answered within the framework of the isolated interactional context, it is also a question that will not be pursued within CA, since it extends beyond the local organization of meaning and social action into the broader cultural, discursive and ideological organization of meaning and social action.

Wetherell (Wetherell 1998:404) points out that the inclusion of exactly this broader context by means of a poststructuralist and discursive psychological perspective can give a better understanding of the discursive and cultural ‘common sense’ that constitutes the resources for the participants’ arguments, reasonings and interpretations. In other words, every utterance can, apart from being considered as part of a sequential and interactional context, be considered as a manifestation of the interpretative resources that the participants draw on and activate during the interaction. Although such a perspective extends beyond the immediate conversational context, it is nevertheless closely related to and tied in with the local organization of meaning and categories as well as the sequential development of the interaction. Put differently, all utterances may be analyzed in relation to a sequential context and development as well as in relation to established meanings and common-sense understandings.

In the following analysis, it will be shown how the participants’ constructions of nationality, religion and language background forms patterns that reveal structures of meaning around the notion of culture, that resonate traditional notions of culture as institutionalized systems of thought and being that determine individual thought and action. Such notions of culture are closely linked to a cultural relativist form of thinking, which has been influential since Boas (Liep & Olwig 1994:7). Moreover, these notions share a range of common features with the idea of the Nation State, which, as Anderson describes, evolved during the period of Enlightenment (Anderson 1991:5-7). It will be argued that patterns in the membership categorizations established within the internship interview can be said to reveal the influence

of ‘common sense’ understandings of culture that tie in with the negotiations of not only categories related to nationality, language, and religion, but with the orientations of the participants towards each other and towards the speech situation in general.

The notion of interpretative repertoire will be used to shed light on patterns in the logic and reasoning of the participants and to reveal structures in the knowledge and understandings which are taken for granted. As described in chapter 4, I will not apply theories about culture, nationality, religion or ethnicity analytically to explain the actions and behaviour of the participants, but rather to illuminate systematically appearing categorizations, assumptions and meanings related to nationality, language, and religion as they are established and negotiated in interaction. The discursive psychological concept interpretative repertoire can be used to disclose such systematics and to identify and define the understandings that are brought in play from the participants’ actions and utterances, rather than from theoretical considerations and definitions.

As Wetherell and Potter (Wetherell & Potter 1988:177-78) describe, the identification and definition of interpretative repertoires requires a description of their systematic appearance and use throughout a larger corpus of data. Since various repertoires are characterized by their incommensurability, difference and variability in relation to a local function (Wetherell & Potter 1988), this is done by demonstrating how their appearance in a given text or interaction is separated and different from the appearance of other opposite repertoires and by showing the participants’ orientation towards this difference and incommensurability. It is not possible, based on merely one extract to define and identify the interpretative repertoires related to nationality, language and religion that the participants are possibly applying, since one extract does not reveal the variability of argumentation and meaning, and thereby the incommensurability and difference that defines different repertoires. The following analysis of how will therefore examine and compare the various categorizations related to nationality, language and religion throughout the entire data-collection.

The concept of Membership Categorization Device is a useful tool to describe categorizations, and how the establishment of certain categories and their affiliation with category-bound-activities establish and organize the social world in a specific way. In the following analysis, I will illustrate and argue that the concept of Membership Categorization Devices does not capture the systems of reasoning or structures of meaning that can be said to inform and influence processes of categorization and link them to ideologies and common

sense. The notion of interpretative repertoire, on the other hand, illuminates this dimension of processes of meaning and social organization. What is highlighted by the concept interpretative repertoire and the discursive psychological perspective is that by using a certain range of words, formulations and images one can index and make relevant a specific interpretative framework that links the local categorizations, actions and behaviour of interactants to a discursive, cultural and ideological context. One could say that MCD's and categories are enmeshed with a range of interpretative repertoires and can be identified in relation to these, but that an interpretative repertoire is never confined to a single category or a collection of categories and can only be identified in relation to a patterns of categorization. By looking at both, one can illuminate the interrelation of locally produced meanings and social organization and broader structures of meaning and ideology.

5.2 Introduction to the Analysis

The combination of a membership categorization perspective and an interpretative repertoire perspective provides the means to investigate *gatekeeping* in internship interviews, or more specifically, *how membership categories related to nationality, language and religion are established, negotiated and evaluated in internship interviews and how this systematically establishes a particular distribution of rights, knowledge and status between the participants.*

During all of the internship interviews, at one time or another, one or some of the participants oriented to either the national, religious or language membership of the candidates which was related to an either implicit or explicit orientation to the category of 'Danes' and an implicit or explicit exclusion of the internship candidates' from this category. What will be argued and illustrated in the following analysis is how the categorizations related to nationality, language and religion are highly influenced by common sense notions of culture as a particular 'way of doing things' and a 'system of values and practices'. While culture were in some cases explicitly topicalised, in most cases it was implicitly made relevant through the topicalisation of nationality, language or religion, but the general outcome was an increased focus on the difference or otherness of the candidates in relation to the nationality, language, 'culture' or religion of 'Danes'.

As discussed in chapter 4, the notion of culture is problematic, controversial and generally ambiguous -- not only within an academic context, but for ordinary people in interaction. A major part of the analysis will consist in describing and comparing the various ways in which the participants orient to and construct actions, things or people as cultural or

culturally related. Making culture relevant or constructing it as a phenomenon which is used to explain or account for actions, activities, situations or contexts is commonly not done without specific reference to culture, but to other phenomena and categories that can be seen as related to culture.

Other studies have been made of topicalisations of ethnic group membership in interactions between native speakers and non-native speakers, which deal with both how it is done and what the consequences of it are. In a study of multicultural workplaces Dennis Day (1994; 1998; 2006) describes how the ethnicity or the otherness of employees with a non-British background is continually made relevant in informal conversations between co-workers with the consequence that their competences and qualifications in relation to specific activities or groups at the work-place were put in doubt. He describes the phenomenon as ethnification, but according to the definition proposed in section 2.3.5 it could also be described as gatekeeping, which I will return to at the end of the analysis.

Another study by Roberts and Campbell shows how in British job-interviews, differences in communicative style and linguistic capital with born abroad applicants are considered an expression of insufficient work competence (Roberts & Campbell 2006:102-104), and how foreign work experience is often discredited in these job interviews on the grounds of the employers' prejudices (Ibid.:118). They furthermore describe how the interviewer perceives it as negative and unpleasant when born abroad applicants make their ethnic background relevant in a job-interview, because it dissociates them from the interviewer in terms of both work and ethnicity (Roberts & Campbell Forthcoming:18).

What Roberts and Campbell suggest is that topicalising ethnicity and making it relevant works to penalize the ethnic minority candidates in relation to the British candidates by inserting a compartmentalizing division between their personal lives and their work lives. This division works against the implicit requirement of the employers that the candidates should integrate personal, occupational and institutional discourses (Roberts & Campbell Forthcoming:17-18). They link these implicit requirements within the job-interview to a development within the organisational and corporate world towards the simultaneous privileging of individualism and standardisation of corporate values.

The study by Roberts and Campbell and the study by Day both show that when ethnicity or a specific cultural membership is foregrounded in an interaction, it has consequences for the interactional development and the distribution of rights, knowledge and status between the

participants. They furthermore illustrate how locally established meanings of cultural background are linked to broader ideologies and structures of meaning, and that the gatekeeping that takes place is informed by certain structures of meaning and assumptions about immigrants and ethnicity.

In this analysis, I will describe these two relations, i.e. how making cultural membership or cultural otherness relevant influences the future development of an interaction and how members' categorizations related to nationality, language and religion reveal processes of gatekeeping that are fuelled by and reproduce ideologies and common sense assumptions related to immigration, language learning, culture and religion.

I will begin each section of the analysis by describing and analysing the local establishment and orientation towards social categories related to nationality, language and religion and proceed by expanding this perspective to the broader context of the speech situation and the cultural and linguistic context in which it is embedded.

The analysis is structured in a way that first separates the three different ways that I found the participants orienting to the cultural otherness of the candidates, and secondly, seeks to compare them in relation to more general patterns in form, function and content. The first section looks at how Danish 'culture' is made relevant in relation to categorizations of nationality, and argues that nationality or national group membership is not only associated with a specific place of birth, but with a specific organization and understanding of reality.

The second section examines how Danish 'culture' is made relevant in relation to categorizations related to language and linguistic resources. More specifically, the construction of specific speech communities is linked to specific systems of knowledge and used as criteria of distinction and exclusion from another system of knowledge, namely Danish 'culture'.

The third section investigates how religion is made relevant and similarly used as an explanatory basis for actions and understandings that are constructed as different from and incompatible with common practice and common sense in Denmark. In the final section 5.6, these findings are considered in relation to the notion of gatekeeping and discussed as more general strategies of inclusion and exclusion.

Before moving into the actual analysis the following three tables give an initial overview of the number and distribution of interviews in which nationality, language, and religion are made relevant.

Table 4: Cases where nationality or culture is made relevant³¹:

	Employer	Employee	Job-consultant	Candidate	Total interviews ³²	Total cases ³³
Initiating int.	7	1		6	8	20
Follow-up int.	4		2	2	6	11
Total int.	11	1	2	7	14	31
Total cases	16	1	5	9		31

Table 5: Cases where language is made relevant:

	Employer	Employee	Job-consultant	Candidate	Total interviews	Total cases
Initiating int.	6	4	1	3	9	23
Follow-up int.	4		4	4	7	17
Total int.	10	4	5	7	16	40
Total cases	19	5	9	7		40

Table 6: Cases where religion is made relevant:

	Employer	Employee	Job-consultant	Candidate	Total interviews	Total cases
Initiating Int.	3	1		1	4	5
Follow-up int.					0	0
Total int.	3	1		1	4	5
Total cases	3	1		1		5

The tables displaying the three ways in which the otherness of the candidate is made relevant, show that language is the most predominant. It is made relevant in all of the interviews at one time or another, and often more than once during the interviews, which gives a total of 40 cases. Nationality is almost as predominant, since it is topicalised and made relevant in 14 of the interviews, which corresponds to about 81 % of the total number of interviews. Again, there are several interviews in which it is made relevant more than once, which gives a total of 31 cases in which culture or nationality is explicitly topicalised. Finally, religion is a markedly less predominant topic in the interviews, with a total of 5 cases of religion being made

³¹ The present table includes orientations towards culture and nationality, although the latter cases do not always seem to involve the former and vice versa. They are combined based on the observation that one was often implying the other.

³² Duplicate cases from the same interviews have been left out in this figure, which means that the number in this column may be smaller than the sum of the numbers appearing in the columns to the left of it.

³³ Some of the interviews figuring to the left of this column had more than one case of nationality, language, religion or culture being made relevant, which means that the number figuring in this column may exceed the sum of the numbers to the left of it.

relevant, distributed over 4 different interviews. As opposed to the topicalisation of language, culture and nationality, which occurred in both initiating and follow-up interviews, the topicalisation of religion only occurs in the initiating interviews, and in none of these cases is it introduced by the job-consultant.

5.3 How are Categories Related to 'Nationality' made Relevant?

What we have to do is to try to construct what a procedure might be for determining what it is that's being referred to when somebody says 'you, 'we, etc.

- Harvey Sacks, Spring 1966 (1995:333)

This first section of the analysis investigates some of the cases where nationality is explicitly topicalised by the participants and used to account for actions, experiences and competences or to characterize the working context that the candidate will encounter and be a part of. While nationality can from a theoretical point of view be described as a distinct category, it is often closely related or even conflated with a notion of culture by the participants in interaction in the sense that a specific nationality is constructed as implicative of a general cultural framework and membership of this framework. Similarly, the 'culture' of a given individual is spoken about in ways which implies its linkage to a certain nationality. In this section, no attempt will be made to tease culture and nationality apart theoretically and use such a separation to structure the analysis. Rather I will investigate how the participants construct and use these categories, at times as separate and at times as interchangeable phenomena.

I will focus on two examples taken from two different internship interviews that both illustrate how nationality in some cases is made relevant in relation to a discussion of what the candidate can learn from the internship, i.e. in relation to the issue of previous versus future experiences. The two examples will show how nationality may be used as a resource in the assessment of the candidate, and the topicalisation of assumed problems or benefits that a future internship may bring. Other examples will be included to further illustrate this main argument.

The first example is from an interview with a Colombian candidate for an internship as a kindergarten teacher at a school. The extract follows a short discussion of the importance of the intern's previous experience with teaching pre-school children in Colombia. The applicant has previously been trained and worked as a pre-school teacher in Colombia. Previous to the extract the participants have been discussing the length of the internship, and the employer has suggested that the three months period is a bit short in order for the candidate to experience the full development span of the children during the year. The candidate has responded to this by

pointing out that the candidate has experience with this from Colombia, and the extract begins with the employer's response to this.

Extract 30: Colombia (repeated extract)

9
10 HO: Men jeg vil tro (.) sådn (.) uden at vide noget som helst om
11 But I would think (.) like (.) without knowing anything about
12
13 HO: Colombia så vil jeg tro at man i en børnehaveklasseforløb her går
14 Colombia I would think that you in an pre-school class here go
15
16 HO: (.) fra (.) en meget mere (.) >hvad skal man sige< (.) regelstyret
17 (.) from (.) a much more (.) >what can you say< (.) rulegoverned
18
19 HO: indgang i skolen til en meget mere hvas øøh (.) a man ka- ik- sige
20 approach to school to a much more wha- eeh (.) ya- you can't say
21
22 HO: normstyret men [alligevel] s
23 valuegoverned [but still] s
24
25 EM: [MEGET MEGET LÆRIN[G >leg og læring< er blandet
26 [A LOT A LOT OF LEARNING >play and learning< is mixed
27 EM: [sammen ik==
28 [together right-
29
30 HO: [ja]
31 [yes]
32
33 HO: =ja=
34 =yes=
35
36 IN: =ja (0.2) [ja meget meget (der)
37 =yes (0.2) [yes very very (there)
38
39 HO: [>^hvor hvor^< hvo:r hvor børnenes egen
40 [>^where where< whe:re where the childrens own
41
42 HO: forvaltning (0.4) er ret stor fordi=
43 administration (0.4) is pretty big because=
44
45 IN: =ja: (.) der er ligesom en introduktion til i skole faktis=-
46 =Ye:a. (.)there is sort of an introduction to in school actual=-
47
48 HO: =ja (.) nå=
49 =yes (.) oh=
50
51 IN: =i- der i Colombia [(.)så de ko:mmer å: (.) la:ngsommere de=
52 =in- there in Colombia[(.)so they co:me an- (.) slo:wly they=

The extract begins with HO making an assessment in line 10 of the kindergarten system in Colombia by comparing a rule-governed and a norm-governed kindergarten system. Anita Pomerantz (Pomerantz 1984:45) argues that in making an assessment, a person simultaneously claims knowledge of that which she or he is assessing. In this case, however, HO is explicitly disclaiming such knowledge, which can be seen as an orientation towards the internship candidate's privileged claim to knowledge vis a vis her being Colombian. HO's utterance 'But I would think without knowing anything about Colombia' makes the category Colombia relevant, and simultaneously expresses the implication that the other participants in the interaction know (or know more) about Colombia. Since the category Colombia cannot be applied to any of the participants but IN, IN is indirectly affiliated with this category. Using the terminology of Membership Categorization Analysis, one can say that as the category

Colombia is used, the Membership Categorization Device (MCD) country is activated, which automatically makes other categories within that MCD relevant.

While IN is not directly affiliated with the category Colombia, it can be argued that indirectly this is exactly what happens. Day (1998) describes how a person can be indirectly categorized as a member of a specific group by one of the participants in an interaction categorizing something or someone other than IN as a member of that group. The category is left 'in the air', and is hereby made relevant for the participants in the group. As the category Colombia is used by HO and as it does not apply to any other of the participants than IN, IN is indirectly affiliated with that category. While the mentioning of Colombia makes the cultural identity of the candidate relevant, it simultaneously makes the cultural identity of the other participants relevant. As Harvey Sacks explains, the use of one category within a Membership Categorization Device to categorize a person makes it possible to use other categories within the same MCD to categorize other persons. Sacks calls this principle 'the consistency rule' and describes it in the following way:

A second rule I call "the consistency rule." It holds: If some population of persons is being categorized, and if a category from some device's collection has been used to categorize a first member of the population, then that category or other categories of the same collection may be used to categorize further members of the population. (Sacks 1972b:333)

HO describes a movement from ('gå fra') Colombia as a system characterised by rules to ('til') Denmark as a system characterized by norms and is backed up in this by her colleague in line 22 who adds to the characterization by stressing the importance of learning through play. In other words, the implication seems to be that learning through playing is closely related to a norm- and value-governed system, and that this represents a contrast to a more formal teaching and learning environment dominated by rules.

There is some ambiguity about the meaning of the word 'her' ('here') in line 12, since this could be referring to both Denmark, considering that the interview is taking place in Denmark, and to Colombia since Colombia has just been mentioned. In any case HO is describing a move from one setting to another by using the construction 'gå...fra...til' ('go...from...to'), but this move can either be of a geographical nature (from Colombia to Denmark) or a historical nature describing a pedagogical development 'here' ('her') in Denmark. This ambiguity is not resolved till the end of the extract, which I return to shortly, but the central point is that HO and EM are making Colombia relevant in the negotiation and

co-construction of the meaning of 'børnehaveklasseforløb' ('pre-school class'), and they do so by using the categories 'regel-styrel' (rule-governed) and 'norm-styret' (norm-governed) to make a comparison along either a geographical or historical line of development.

Having argued then that the use of the category 'Colombia' indirectly affiliates IN with Colombia and the other participants with Denmark, the following characterization of rule-governed versus norm-governed can be heard as distinguishing between the former mentioned country, Colombia and the country which the other participants are from, namely Denmark. This supports the interpretation that the development being described with the 'fra-til' ('from-to') is in fact a geographical rather than a historical one. The fact that HO initiates her utterance with the wording 'Men jeg vil tro' ('But I would think') and continues with 'så vil jeg tro' ('then I would think') suggests that she is not speaking about a historical genealogy of the Danish system, but that she is rather making a tentative characterization of how it must be to move from a Colombian system to a Danish system.

What is central, in any case, is that by this 'from-to' construction the norm-governed system is constructed as the present 'now' and the rule-governed as the past 'then'. Furthermore, it is central that by linking the category Colombia with a specific kindergarten system, HO and EM show that they not only orient to and construct Colombia as a nationality but as a 'culture' characterized by a specific value- and norm-system, which is manifested in a specific organization and structure of kindergarten.

Before describing the further development in this negotiation of kindergarten and the way it ties in with a negotiation of Colombia and ultimately the identity of IN, a couple of things should be noted about the format of HO's utterance and how that contributes to the sequential development of the sequence and ties in with the negotiation of meaning taking place. From a conversation analytical perspective all utterances, their format, their sequential placement and their timing has a specific function, which is constantly negotiated between the participants. The specific construction of a specific utterance thus signals a potential meaning and simultaneously projects a future development of the interaction.

The hedging and hesitation in HO's initial utterance such as 'så vil jeg tro' ('then I would think'), and 'sådn-' ('like') in line 10 and 13 in this case indicates a reluctance on HO's behalf to make claims about Colombia and suggests potential future delicacy. This format can be said to have a social and an interactional function. The social function consists in preventing or decreasing the chances of a negative response to her claim and the interactional function is

the elicitation of a response from the other participants. Word-search and signs of hesitation may invite others to finish an ongoing utterance (Nielsen et al. 2005). This elicitation proves successful, as EM responds by taking the floor in line 21 where she elaborates HO's characterisation.

The fact that EM interrupts HO at this exact point can be seen as a result of HO's word-search signalling a possible completion point and her final 'men' ('but') signalling that she is trailing off the subject and giving over the turn to someone else. Supporting this interpretation is the fact that HO in line 28 responds to EM's interruption as relevant and meaningful in relation to the characteristic that HO has just made. She overlaps EM's supplementary utterance with a 'yes' and yet another 'yes' right after ME's 'ik' ('right'), which is a tag question that projects a confirmation and simultaneously signals a possible completion point.

HO's and ME's cooperation from line 10 through 19 on characterizing the Colombian society in a specific way in relation to the Danish may thus be described sequentially. First, HO elicits a response to her characterization, which she receives from EM, who then elicits a confirmation of her addition. From line 10-20 HO and EM seem to produce agreement on a characterization of a specific kindergarten system – the ambiguity of which one is, however, not yet resolved – as being norm-governed, with play and learning being integrated. With EM's utterance in line 22, the contrasting element of this characterization is backgrounded, and a more specific characterization of one specific system is fore-grounded. This shift from a more contrastive and comparative description of kindergarten to a more defining characterization of its content postpones the solving of the ambiguity in HO's initial utterance, since it enables IN to meaningfully confirm and support EM's elaborative utterance without having to deal with the contrast set up by HO.

In line 34, a place for IN to take the floor presents itself, since HO has confirmed EM's supplementary utterance and IN uses this opportunity to confirm what has just been said by EM and confirmed by HO. She does so by using what Pomerantz (1986) refers to as an extreme case formulation, namely 'meget meget der' ('very very there'), which is described as a device used to legitimise a claim. In this example, it has the function of showing and emphasizing alignment with the descriptions offered by HO and EM, but it comes off as ambiguous, since it lacks a verb and it is unclear what 'der' ('there') refers to in the previous. What nevertheless links it to the EM's utterance is the fact that IN is repeating her wording, hereby showing alignment to the description EM has just given. By not picking up the

contrasting element offered in HO's initial utterance and giving a non-specific confirmation of the following, IN contributes to the move away from a discussion of cultural difference manifested in two different kindergarten systems to a discussion of kindergarten as such.

What is interesting here then, and which doesn't become clear for HO until later in the interaction, is that even though IN seems to confirm the characterization of Colombia and Denmark co-constructed by HO and EM, she is more likely merely expressing recognition of the Danish kindergarten system, which mixes play and learning. Her following description of pre-school as 'sort of introduction to schooling' in line 43 does not support HO's characterization of the system in Colombia. Rather, it describes the function of a pre-school system, which seems quite similar to the function of pre-school in Denmark. While it is unclear whether this description is referring to school in Colombia or Denmark, the following response from HO in line 46, 'ja nå', suggests that she interprets her description as being of Colombia.

At this point, IN has not yet gotten a chance to continue her description of kindergarten in Colombia, since she is overlapped by HO in line 37, who continues her previous action of describing the difference between Colombia and Denmark. She does this by using the words 'hvor hvor' ('where where'), which is syntactically constructed as a continuation of a previous sentence and can be interpreted as a way of signalling that she had not finished talking and of linking her present utterance to her previous one. Furthermore, in using the word 'hvor' ('where') she re-emphasizes that what she is describing is a specific context rather than a general understanding of kindergartens. This other setting, namely Denmark, is then further defined as a place where children learn to be responsible and monitor their own behaviour

IN takes the floor in line 43, and displays her understanding of what HO is describing, first by giving the affirmative response 'ja' ('yea') to HO's utterance, and after a short micro-pause by continuing with what seems to be an elaboration of the description of kindergarten that HO is making. The fact that she uses the indexical 'der' ('there'), makes it ambiguous whether she is talking about Colombia or Denmark, which is an ambiguity that is carried on from HO's previous use of the indexical 'hvor' ('where'). IN's utterance in line 43 can, in other words, be understood as describing the kindergarten system in Colombia and in Denmark.

In line 46 the employer responds immediately with a confirming 'yes', which suggests that she interprets IN's utterance as a confirmation plus elaboration of the system in Denmark. However, after a micro-pause HO changes this into 'nå' ('oh'), which within the CA literature

is described as a change of state token that indicates some kind of realization or change in understanding (Heritage 1984a). As Heritage describes:

It is now well established that the particle *oh* is frequently used to acknowledge new information, e.g. answers to questions..., and that it commonly functions as a minimal “third turn” expansion, i.e. one with sequence-closing import, to question/answer adjacency pairs. In such contexts, where *oh* is produced as a response to information of some kind, it functions as a “change of state” token; it registers, or at least enacts the registration of, a change in its producer’s state of knowledge or information. (Heritage 2006:311)

The use of the particle *oh* has thus been described as a response to information that displays a registration of a change in the producer’s state of knowledge or information which has the function of closing a topic. In Denmark, the use of the change of state token ‘nå’ (‘oh’) has been described by Mie Femø Nielsen (Nielsen 2002:92-94), who argues that it is a way of signalling a change in the speakers level of informedness and a change in their attitude, which seems likely in this case. Hence, HO shows that she realizes that IN is actually describing something about Colombia, which is new to HO and at least challenges the contrastive description HO has given of Colombia and Denmark.

This point represents a turning point in the distribution of talk between the participants on the subject of Colombia which can be argued to be related to a more general change in footing, as defined by Goffman, between HO and IN. Goffman describes how “a change in footing implies a change in alignment we take up to ourselves and others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance” (Goffman 1981:128), and such a change arguably takes place upon the aforementioned change of state token. As it will appear from the following part of the example, IN now launches into a fuller and more detailed description of the Colombian Kindergarten, and is given space to do so by HO and EM. While the initial part of the interaction was influenced by the authoritative stance of HO, who seemed to push her description of the Colombian system as contrastive to the Danish system, the footing now changes as HO displays the discourse identity of recipient and IN takes on the discourse identity of primary speaker and furthermore displays authority regarding knowledge about the Colombian system.

Extract 30: Colombia (continued)

49 IN: =i- der i Colombia [(.)så de ko:mmer å: (.) la:ngsommere de=
50 =in- there in Colombia[(.)so they co:me an- (.) slo:wly they=
51
52 HO: [ja]
53 [yes]
54
55 IN: =tilpasser sil tiden tidel (.) til øøhm (.) øh farske
56 =adjust (sil) time (tidel)(.) to eehm (.) eh difficoul
57
58 >forskellig-< farver de skal lære i
59 >different-< coulours they must learn in
60
61 HO: ja
62 yes
63
64 (0.4)
65
66 IN: øøh (0.3) i klassen (0.4) det er meget meget langsomt men også
67 eeh (0.3) in class (0.4) it is very very slowly but also
68
69 IN: (0.4) de er me:ge:klar over for (0.2) de forventer at
70 (0.4) they are very clear about (0.2) they expect that
71
72 IN: børnene nå nå: nå de er færdige med børnehaveklasse,
73 the children when- whe:n when they are done with kindergarten,
74
75 IN: (0.4) så de er klar til at ta- i skolen og de er klar
76 (0.4) so they are ready to go to the school and they are ready
77
78 IN: til tiden og de er klar til øh .hh til a argumentere hvad de
79 in time and they are ready to eh .hh to a argue what they
80
81 IN: tænker om å (0.2)
82 are thinking about an- (0.2)
83
84 HO: ja (0.2) ja
85 yes (0.2) yes
86
87 (0.6)
88
89 HO: Arhm det lyder jo ikke så forskelligt=
90 well that does (hedge) not (hedge) sound so different=
91
92 EM: [=ne:j
93 [=no:

After the change of state token by HO, IN immediately continues her turn in line 49 by specifying that she is talking about Colombia, which indicates that she catches on to HO's utterance as a display of confusion. In other words, she accounts for or explains her previous utterance as a response to HO's change of state token. HO responds to this in overlap, hereby confirming the re-established intersubjectivity, but without interrupting IN's turn, which continues first until line 61, where HO gives a minimal response 'ja' followed by a pause allowing IN to continue, and finally until line 84 where HO again responds with a 'yes', a pause, another yes and a (0.6) pause. The description IN gives paints a very positive image of the system in Colombia from line 49 to 81, which stresses that learning how to go to school is a slow process (line 49, 66), where the students adapt to time (line 55, 78) and learn about different colours (line 58) and about how to express their thoughts (line 78-81).

It is important to note how the behaviour and response of HO facilitates IN's extended explanation stretching over several units and turns, or what in the CA literature is referred to as a multi-unit-turn. Multi-unit-turns are to a greater extent single-unit turns, something that

needs to be jointly accomplished by the participants (Nielsen & Nielsen 2005), since it demands that the speaker uses several different strategies to keep the turn, or that the other participants refrain from taking the turn in the various places where they can. Hence, IN makes various short pauses, where another speaker might have taken the floor, but as they don't, IN interprets this as an encouragement to go on. The other participants can support this by signalling to the speaker that he or she should continue talking by using nods, smiles or words like 'yes' or mhm.

This form of listener behaviour, which is prevalent during extended turns at talk have been described by Schegloff as *continuers* in a specific study of the use of 'uh huh,' which is the English equivalent to the Danish 'mm' or mhm'. He describes how the most common function of *continuers* is to "exhibit on the part of its producer an understanding that an extended unit of talk is underway by another, and that it is not yet, or may not yet be (even ought not yet be), complete." (Schegloff 1982:81) However, Schegloff also argues that *continuers* can have other functions as well such as expressing enthusiasm and encouragement on behalf of the listener, or they can mark agreement and their particular meaning should for this reason be analyzed in relation to the sequential context in which they occur (Kjærbeck 1998b:69).

In the present example, the continuer in line 52 seems to encourage IN to continue speaking, which is supported by the minimal response in line 61 and the encouraging 'yes' in line 82. However, since IN does not continue speaking here, HO supplies another 'yes' after a short pause, which simultaneously presents a final opportunity for IN to take the turn as well as recognition of what she has previously stated. Since IN does not offer any further elaboration, HO finally takes the floor in line 89 and responds to IN's multi-unit description of the system in Colombia with a summarizing statement, which can be said to be formatted as what is referred to as a *formulation* within CA.

The action of formulating, was first described by Garfinkel and Sacks in 1970 as a description or summary by a person of his/her own actions or the actions of others as a means of establishing a joint understanding of an ongoing activity (Antaki et al. 2005:627). In Garfinkel and Sacks words formulations are a conversational means to...

"...treat some part of the conversation as an occasion to describe that conversation, to explain it, or characterize it, or explicate, or translate, or summarize, or furnish the gist of it, or take note of its accordance with rules, or remark on its departure

from rules. That is to say, a member may use some part of the conversation as an occasion to formulate the conversation..." (Garfinkel & Sacks 1970:350)

Formulations are a way to display an understanding of what is being talked about (Drew 2003:297). This can be done by either summarizing the *gist* of what has previously been stated, or by suggesting the implications or the *upshot* of it, the former involving the deletion, selection and rephrasing of what has been said and the latter involving the extraction of an implication of it. The present example may be said to be a mixture of an upshot and a gist formulation in the sense that it is at once rephrasing what the internship candidate has said and extracting an implication from it ('well that does not sound so different'). Heritage and Watson (1979:159) later described how formulations were formatted as adjacency pairs and involved a preference for agreement in the sense that a formulation invited and projected a confirmation by the next speaker (Antaki et al. 2005:627). This observation is supported by the present example where EM confirms HO's formulation in line 92. EM and HO in this way co-operate in summarizing the gist and upshot of what IN has described.

Antaki et al describe how formulations in a psychotherapeutic institutional context are used by the professional as a means to sharpen, refine and clarify the client's accounts and hereby give it a form that enables a following diagnosis (Antaki et al. 2005:627). Thus, a formulation can have the function of pressing the solution or conclusion of a topic of discussion. Apart from this function of contributing to closing a topic down (Heritage & Watson 1979:152), which is seen in the present example, formulations can furthermore have a supportive effect in that they display understanding. This is found in interview situations such as the internship interview or language testing interviews as demonstrated by Brown (Brown 2003:10-11).

With her repeated 'ja' ('yes') in line 84 and her formulation in line 89, HO can in this way be said to signal that she has understood IN's description, confirms it and hereby simultaneously recognises that her own previous description of Colombia must be re-evaluated. HO hereby manages to close the topic and finally solve the ambiguity, while having allowed IN plenty of time to offer additional information.

In sum, this example shows how the nationality of the candidate is made relevant by HO suggesting a contrast between the kindergarten system in Colombia and the kindergarten system in Denmark. This creates a potential problem for the candidate, since the contrast

suggests the incommensurability between a rule-governed (Colombia) and a norm-governed (Denmark) system. The mentioning of the country Colombia sets up a case of special relevance for the candidate who is hereby indirectly associated with not only 'Colombia' but with the rule-governed kindergarten system, which HO attributes to the category 'Colombia'. Simultaneously, IN is dissociated with the category Denmark and the norm-governed system through the consistency rule and the contrasting description of the two 'systems'. This potentially questions the value of the candidate's experience, which as mentioned was the topic of discussion previous to the extract and thereby her competence as a kindergarten teacher. The fact that nationality is made relevant has, in other words, the same negative effect in this example as is described by Roberts and Campbell.

However, the discussion of kindergarten shifts from a defining comparison of two different kindergarten systems to a more descriptive characterization of kindergarten as such. This shift is initiated by the lack of uptake by both EM and IN on the suggested contrast and followed through by the increasingly concrete descriptions of what kindergarten means. This leads finally to a re-evaluation of the nationally based difference between kindergartens in Colombia and Denmark. This is followed by a change in the interactional dynamics and the footing of the interaction from being more authoritative and interviewer controlled to being more dialogic with the interviewer allowing for and encouraging the candidate's participation and perspectives. This change in footing allows for the candidate to construct a positive image of herself as experienced, competent and in tune with the values and system of Danish kindergartens, while at no point having explicitly challenged the contrastive description that HO made initially.

This first example illustrates how the meaning of nationality is closely linked to a notion of 'value systems' that are taken to define and dictate the actions and behaviour of its members. I would argue that what is being formulated here is a conceptual link between nationality and culture. Furthermore, what we see from this example is how the category of nationality or culture is established through opposition and difference. Rather than constructing Colombia as characterized by A, B and, C norms and practices, it is constructed as the opposite of Denmark which is characterized by X, Y, and Z norms and practices. In other words Colombia is defined by that which it is not, and the candidate is hereby also constituted through her 'otherness' and non-Danishness. As the candidate negotiates this through her elaborate descriptions of the Colombian kindergarten, she manages to challenge the association

of Colombia non-Danishness and offer an alternative range of concrete practices that are acknowledged by the other participants as compatible with and similar to the Danish system. A construction of cultural opposition and difference is negotiated and changed into a joint construction of cultural similarity. This change can be said to be crucial for a recognition of the candidate's experience, and ultimately for a positive assessment of her future possible contribution to the school.

The following example is taken from an interview with a male candidate from Somalia, who is being interviewed for an internship at a fruit farm. The candidate is a trained agronomist and has worked as such in Somalia. The interview took place while the employer was giving the candidate a tour of the orchard, explaining the kind of work he would be involved in. At this point in the interview, the employer has just stated that she probably won't be able to teach the candidate anything professionally. She then goes on to explain what she imagines that he will get out of the internship.

Extract 25: Danish (repeated extract)

73 HO: Men jeg kan give dig en fornemmelse af (0.6) hvad der sker
 74 But I can give you a sense of (0.6) what happens
 75 (0.8)
 76 HO: Hvad det er vi lægger vægt på og hvordan vi gerne vil (0.2) øøh
 77 ha' vores produkter
 78 what it is we emphasize and how we would like to have (0.2)
 79 eeh our products
 80
 81
 82 IN: mm=
 83 HO: =øøh vores butiksform
 84 =eeh our way of the store
 85 (0.6)
 86 HO: Du kommer i kontakt
 87 You will be in contact
 88 (0.2)
 89 IN: jae=
 90 Yea=
 91
 92 HO: =hvis du kommer ind til mig i butikken her så har du kontakt
 93 med nogle [kunder] nogle der taler dansk
 94 =if you come with me in the store here you have contact
 95 with some [clients] some that speak Danish
 96
 97
 98 IN: [ja]
 99 [yes]
 100 (0.4)
 101 IN: ja=
 102 yes=

What I would like to bring attention to in this example is the description of what the intern will be able to learn or gain from the internship. The extract begins with HO giving a three-part list of the things that HO can 'offer' IN during the internship, namely a sense of 'hvad der sker' ('what happens'), 'hvad det er vi lægger vægt på' ('what it is we emphasize'), and 'hvordan vi

gerne vil ha' vores produkter' ('how we would like our products to be'). While the first part of the list is formulated neutrally (what happens), the second and third part are formulated personally (we emphasize, and we want) which establishes the category 'we' and associates it with the activities of producing something. Since HO is the one establishing the 'we' she is automatically constructed as a member of the category, while IN is excluded from the 'we' through HO's initial construction of IN as the 'learner' and herself as the 'teacher' or 'mentor' in the utterance 'I can give you a sense of...'. After a minimal response from IN, HO elaborates with what seems to be a summary of the list, namely 'vores butikksform' ('our way of the store'), which again emphasizes her relation to the category 'producers' and elaborates the definition of this category by associating it with not only production, but also selling the products and doing it in a specific 'way'. Up until this point what is established is, in other words, the category 'farmers' which is associated with a specific practice, that of producing and selling products.

What HO seems to be doing with this description is to present the terms of the internship in the sense 'this is what you are going to get,' and this projects some sort of acceptance from IN, which would constitute an agreement about the contents of the internship. However, this response fails to materialize, and after a 0.6 second pause HO continues her description of what IN will gain from the internship, but now taking it in what seems to be a different direction. In line 87 she states that IN will 'be in contact' but she pauses for 0.2 seconds which elicits a 'yea' from IN. HO then restarts in line 93 with a hypothetical construction, which emphasizes that if IN comes to work with HO in the store, then he will have contact with some clients, and she finishes off by specifying in line 94 that it will be someone who speaks Danish. Thus, HO moves from what can be learned about the products and the selling of the products and the 'way of the store' to the interaction with the customers, and more specifically the Danish customers.

I would argue that the category 'Danish' is made relevant through a categorical link being implicitly made between the previously constructed category 'farmers' and the category 'Danes'. The interactional and interpretative resources that enable this are partially to be found in the sequential context of that given moment in the internship interview, which is furnished by the categorizations of HO. Furthermore, it is informed by the speech situation as such, and the discursive and ideological context in which it is embedded. Finally, it is partly related to IN's transportable identity as second-language speaker, which can be said to be made

potentially relevant through the IN's minimal responses. The latter will be dealt with separately in the following section 8.4.4. The former two aspects ties in with the previous argument that the membership categories established in relation to language, religion and nationality are informed by assumptions about Danish culture as a 'system of thought,' and that the category membership of the candidate is established in relation to processes of distinction and differentiation between this 'system of thought'.

When looking at the shift from talking about the products and the selling of the products to talking about the contact with the customers, it is not formatted as presenting something new or different from the previous, but rather as an elaboration or summary of it. The issue of 'being in contact' is constructed as a meaningful follow-up to the previous utterance 'our way of the store'. As mentioned previously, the utterance 'our way of the store' works as a summary of the three-part list which established the category 'farmer', but apart from this sequential function, it also has the function of making the category 'grocers' more relevant than the category 'farmers'. The use of the word 'butik' ('store') signals that what has previously been said about 'the products', 'what happens' and 'what is emphasized' should be understood in relation to the category Grocers rather than Farmers. In this way the word 'butikform' can be said to work as what I would call a semantic contextualization cue, which signals that what is being talked about here is what goes on within the store rather than within the farm.

In this light the move from line 84 to 86 seems meaningful and more like a topical glide,³⁴ since 'coming into contact' and the more elaborate 'contact with some clients' can be read as a category bound activity to the category 'grocers', which is made relevant with the introduction of the category 'butik' ('store'). What still needs to be explained, however, is why HO changes 'with some clients' to 'some that speak Danish'. This change or supplement, I will argue, is related to the categorical opposition between 'vi' ('we') and 'du' ('you'), which is introduced and continued from the beginning of the extract. This, in combination with the suggestion of a specific 'way' of the store and the farm, makes relevant not only the professional but the cultural and linguistic otherness of the candidate and paves the way for the specific topicalisation in line 94.

³⁴ The notion of topical glide was originally introduced by Adelswärd (Adelswärd 1988) and has been used by Roberts and Campbell (Roberts & Campbell 2006) in their study of job-interviews in Britain. It describes the gradual rather than sudden shift from one topic to another and is, according to Adelswärd, more likely to occur in interactions where the participants share an understanding of the interview structure and aspects of social identity (Roberts & Campbell 2006:163).

As mentioned previously, the category ‘we’ is established right in the beginning of the extract and HO is constructed as a member of this category, who, based on this membership, can introduce IN as a non-member of the category ‘we’ to its practices, norms and standards. While it seems that the members of the category ‘we’ are the people on the Orchard, this is never made explicit and is made difficult to infer from the activities that are attributed to the members such as ‘we value’, ‘we would like our products’. These activities could be interpreted as bound to the category ‘farmers’ or ‘grocers’ in general, and it is not specified whether HO is speaking as a member of such broader categories or as representative of ‘farmers’ at her Orchard particularly. What is clear, however, is that IN is constructed as a non-member of the ‘we,’ since HO is exactly describing something she is able to ‘give IN a sense of’. In this light, it seems likely that the category HO is referring to by ‘we’ is the smaller category of ‘farmers at the Orchard’. But since this is never specified, she is simultaneously indexing another category of grocers or farmers of which IN is not a member, namely the category ‘Danish farmers’.

The ambiguity or possible conflation of the category ‘farmers at the Orchard’ and ‘Danish farmers’ is made even more pronounced in line 83 where HO summarizes the previous category bound activities as a specific ‘butikksform,’ which I have translated as ‘way of the store,’ but which is actually more abstract in that it does not refer to a specific store, but rather to a ‘way of running the business’ in general’. This can be said to index a broader context of ‘store-practice’ than merely the Orchard while indicating a specificity of ‘ours’ in relation to ‘yours’.

While it is not possible to determine whether she is doing one or the other, or both, the unspecified category of ‘we’ referring to an infinite community of farmers, followed by a specification of a specific ‘way’ of the store, and finally a specification of the clients that frequent the store, namely ‘some that speak Danish’ works to establish and make relevant the category of ‘Danish farmers’. Even if one should disagree with or contest the argument that the category of Danish farmers is made potentially relevant at the time of the first unspecified ‘we’, there is no doubt that ‘Danish’ is established as the relevant category membership in line 92, and that this informs or specifies the previously undefined categories of ‘we’ and ‘our’. Following such argumentation, the utterance ‘some that speak Danish,’ works sequentially and categorically as a summary of what is previously described and implied, namely that IN,

through working in the store, will be introduced to the ‘ways’ of producing, farming and trading at the Orchard and in Denmark more generally.

IN is in other words simultaneously constructed as a non-member of the category ‘people from the Orchard’ and ‘people from Denmark’. This argument is supported when looking at the following part of the extract where the category ‘Danish’ is further elaborated as something associated with more than just the language.

Extract 25: Danish (continued)

103
104 HO: =Nogen der spørger om no: get som [ger]ne vil vide noget om
105 =Someone who asks about so: mething who [woul]d like to know about
106
107 IN: [mm]
108 HO: produkterne
109 the products
110 (0.4)
111 IN: Jeg [f(ik da ve di)]
112 I [f(ik da ve di)]
113
114 HO: [Og det (.) kan man lære] lidt af også
115 [and that (.) one can learn] a little from also
116 (0.7)
117 HO: at (0.3) jamen hvad er det folk øh går o: g og tænker o: g de smager
118 og de øh hvad sker der
119
120 that (0.3) well what is it people eh go a: nd and think and they taste
121 and they eh what happens
122 (0.8)
123 HO: øøhm så jeg lægger sådan set nok meget op til at du får nogle
124 oplevelser
125
126 Eehm so I am kind of eh encouraging a lot that you get some
127 experiences
128 (0.8)
129 HO: som du så kan bearbejde o: g øh o- tage med dig hvor du nu skal læ: se
130 eller hvad du nu skal læ: se eller øh videre frem
131
132 that you can then digest a: nd eh a- take with you wherever you will
133 stu: dy or whatever you will stu: dy or eh further ahead
134 (0.3)
135 IN: mm
136
137 HO: øhm
138 ehm
139 (2.6)
140 HO: For ligesom at komme lidt tæt på:
141 To kind of get a little closer to:
142 (0.8)
143 HO: noget der er lidt mere dansk måske ik o- d- end bare lige at gå bag
144 kulisserne
145
146 something that is a little more Danish perhaps right o- d- than just
147 walking behind the scenes

This second part of the extract generally consists of various accounts offered by HO for why IN should come work at the store, and these accounts are centrally focused on the various ways in which it will represent a chance for the candidate to meet and experience Danish life. In line 104 HO offers an elaboration of the category ‘Danish customers’, which was established in the previous lines. The category is associated with the category-bound activity ‘asking questions about the products’, which together with the utterance ‘some that speak Danish’ in line 93 implies what is finally stated in line 114, namely that this is another thing which IN can learn from, when working in the store. This supports what was argued earlier, namely that when HO

is constructing an ‘us’ which IN can learn from, this us refers to both workers at the Orchard and Danes more generally, since the practices to be learned are now made to include not only producing and selling the goods but interacting with Danes, speaking Danish. It is, however, not yet specified what is to be learned from the latter, rather it is quite abstractly stated that ‘that one can learn a little from also’.

This utterance is made in overlap with IN. In the example shown, the participation and responses from IN have previously been minimal, but after HO’s utterance from line 104 to line 108, there is a pause which IN uses to take the floor and say something which begins with ‘jeg’ (‘I’) but is hardly understandable after that, partly perhaps because of the interruption by HO. IN does not stop talking despite the interruption, but since this does not make HO give back the floor, he finally gives up and allows HO to finish the fore-mentioned utterance ‘and that one can learn a little from also’, which can be seen as a statement that has the function of suggesting a closing of the topic of what HO can ‘give’ or ‘teach’ IN. IN does not, however, assist HO in this closing or respond in any other way, which leaves a 0.7 pause that finally makes HO retake the floor and make another description of what can be learned from interacting with customers.

What is described in line 117-118 is not how customers ‘ask about something,’ but rather how they ‘think’ (‘tænker’) and ‘taste’ (‘smager’) and ‘what happens’ more generally, which is a more abstract description that is similar to the previous formulation ‘butikksform’ (‘way of the store’). Since this, again, does not receive any response or uptake from IN but is followed by a 0.8 seconds pause, HO makes yet another statement from line 123 to 143 which again ties back to the topic of what she can ‘offer’ and again initiates a closing of the topic by summarizing and repeating what she has said.

This time the utterance is more specifically formatted as a summary in that she explicitly describes what she wants to propose, namely ‘eehm so I am kind of eh encouraging a lot that you get some experiences’. Again, IN only responds minimally, which elicits a hesitation marker from HO followed by a very long pause (2.6 seconds). When this still does not elicit any uptake from IN, HO takes the floor again in line 140 and states the purpose of what she is proposing ‘To kind of get a little closer to’, which implies a distance between IN and what HO is offering. HO does not finish this utterance however, till after a 0.8 second pause, where she summarizes what is being offered, namely ‘something that is a little more Danish than just walking behind the scenes’.

To summarize, I have shown how nationality is made relevant in this second example by HO constructing an unspecified category ‘us’, which indexes a context of farming at the Orchard and a broader national context, and dissociating IN from it by orienting to him as a ‘learner’ or an ‘intern’. The unspecified description of a range of general practices, standards and values which IN is to ‘learn’ constructs the candidate as a professional outsider and furnishes the conversational context for constructing him as a cultural and linguistic outsider or ‘otherness’ as well. In other words, culture is made potentially relevant long before it is made explicit. While this threatens to undermine the value of IN’s experience and competence, the implicit way in which it is done makes it difficult for IN to engage with or negotiate the relevance of culture, which he at no point does.

In section 5.4 it will be discussed and described further how the contribution and participation of IN can be said to contribute to making the category of second language speaker and thereby culture, relevant. The point I wish to make here is that the establishment of the category Danish is informed by an understanding of a certain ‘way’ of doing things, and a certain ‘attitude’ towards farming, producing and selling and certain ‘value’ regarding the quality of the produce. This ‘way’ of feeling, believing and acting associated with the category Danish resembles how, in the previous example, the category Danish was related to a particular norm-governed system in Danish kindergartens.

5.3.1 Interpretative Repertoires Associating ‘Nationality’ with ‘Culture’

Thus far, the analysis has illuminated processes of categorization and membership ascription within specifically limited sequential contexts. Within the boundaries of the various segments the actions and utterances of the participants have been described in relation to the previous actions they respond to and the future actions they project. The CA and MCA framework has thus enabled the illumination of how meaning and social organization related to categories Colombia, Danish, Rule-governed and Value-governed is achieved and produced between the participants. It has, however, not provided insights as to why such categories were made relevant and meaningful at the particular moments studied. In the remaining part of the analysis of how categories related to nationality are made relevant, a somewhat broader perspective on how categorization and categories tie in with broader structures of meaning manifested in the systematic application of particular interpretative repertoires by the participants.

As mentioned previously the two main Membership Categorization Devices being established in extract 30 (Colombia) are the MCD 'Country', made up of the categories Colombia and Denmark, and the MCD 'Kindergarten' made up of the categories value-governed and rule-governed. These two MCD's are constructed as related to each other in a way in which the category Colombia in one MCD implies or determines the category rule-governed from the other MCD. From a CA perspective, this inferential process may be seen to be guided by a combination of the principles 'a case of special relevance' as defined by Day (Day 1998), and the 'consistency rule' as defined by Sacks (Sacks 1972b; Sacks 1972a). It can, however, also be described from a poststructuralist linguistic perspective, which highlights how meaning is carried by words as the traces of a process of *différance*, or differentiation or deferral, from other meanings. In this light, the meaning of Colombia, as it is mentioned by HO, already carries with it other meanings of other words such as 'Denmark' or 'country'. By putting it in the context of other words such as 'børnehaveklasseforløb' ('kindergarten program'), 'regel-styret' ('rule-governed') and 'norm-styret' ('norm-governed') the many potential meanings of the word is temporarily backgrounded, while others are foregrounded. This is, however, a contextually specific process which is not controlled by a person uttering a word and putting it in a specific conversational context; rather it is a process taking place between people in interaction and between language production and language interpretation.

The link between a specific kindergarten system and a national context, which is not questioned but rather elaborated by EM, seems to suggest a shared interpretative resource in which nationality is implying culture, and culture is considered to determine a certain institutional and social organization and a specific set of values regarding teaching, education and child-rearing. Implicit in HO's utterance is, in other words, the assumption that kindergartens within a specific national setting are organized and run according to a specific cultural organization and can therefore be described as a whole. Such an understanding of culture as determining social and institutional organization is closely related and similar to a functionalist understanding of culture. An understanding that is not only the foundation of much research in intercultural communication, but an understanding that has also, due to its dominance within and beyond anthropology, reached wide recognition and spread in the media and among the general public. When Colombia is made relevant and associated with rules and opposed to a different system, which is characterized by norms as well as a mixing of play and learning, it is an expression of a highly ideologically laden construction of valorised

opposition. Similarly, when the category Danish is made relevant and associated with specific norms, practices and values related to producing and selling fruit, and the internship candidate is encouraged to learn from such practices and values, a valorised opposition is created between Danish culture and ‘foreign’ or ‘other’ cultures. What is central is that Danish culture is constructed as primary, and the distinction of and difference from ‘the other’ culture is assumed and unspecified.

What is being established here, I would argue, are not merely two different types of kindergarten or two different countries, but rather two different value-systems and belief-systems regarding child-rearing and education, which is taken to correspond to two different national or cultural contexts. Nevertheless, extract 30 reveals that the participants draw on and construct a certain understanding of nationality as implying a specific ‘culture’ which determines norms and values as well as individual action and experience. This interpretative resource is not only used in this extract, but in other parts of this specific conversation and in some of the other internship interviews. Here is first an example from later in the interview, where the same understanding is expressed. Immediately prior to this extract, the employer has announced that she has had a meeting with the other kindergarten heads before the interview and that both kindergarten classes have shown interest in having the candidate as an intern, and that they will make a schedule that enables the candidate to spend time in both classes.

Extract 31: Music and Dancing

284 HO: hvor begge øh team får får glæde af af (.) af den ressource
 285 where both eh teams will will benefit from from (.)the ressource
 286
 287 du jo sådan set kommer med
 288 you kind of bring with you
 289
 290 IN: okay
 291 okay
 292
 293 HO: så:
 294 so:
 295
 296 (0.4)
 297
 298 HO: Jeg kunne godt tænke mig at vide ka du sådan no: get musik
 299 I would like to know can you such things a:s music
 300
 301 eller: hva- () danse eller [()]
 302 or: what- () dance or [()]
 303
 304 IN: [danse] fjaɐ [ha
 305 [dance] fyesɐ [ha
 306
 307 HO: [Nå men .hh fordi du ka- har jo
 308 [well cause .hh because you
 309 HO: [sikkert nogen: særlige talenter som:
 310 can- probably have some special talents that
 311
 312 HO: (.) kan berige os
 313 (.) can enrich us

When the interpretative context is taken into consideration, which is influenced by the fact that the category Colombia has been made relevant and linked to the candidate's experience, then the utterances 'the resource you kind of bring with you' in line 284-288 and 'you probably have some special talents that can enrich us' in line 307-313 can be understood to express an expectation that IN's competences and qualifications as a kindergarten teacher are specifically shaped by her culture and nationality. This is supported by the fact that HO's utterance in line 307 is constructed as an explanatory follow up to HO's utterance beginning in line 284, which makes 'knowing something about music or dancing' into something special in relation to the competences that the category 'us' possess (i.e. line 313). This extract can in this way be seen as a reproduction of the understanding of culture as a homogenous entity that conditions individual behaviour.

This extract differs however from the previous in that IN's cultural background is here formulated as a resource, whereas in the previous extract it was presented as a barrier. This difference in a positive and negative realisation of the same general understanding of culture, as well as the variation in the function that these two formulations of culture have in the two different conversational contexts, indicates the possibility to distinguish between them based on Potter and Wetherell's notion of interpretative repertoires and Michael Billig's notion of the contrary nature of common sense.

Potter and Wetherell, in their study of racism in New Zealand (Wetherell & Potter 1992:129-134), identify two opposite cultural interpretative repertoires, 'culture as heritage' and 'culture as therapy', that can be said to resemble the formulation of culture as 'barrier' and 'resource' in the two extracts. 'Culture as heritage' formulates an understanding of culture as traditional and unchangeable and links to ideas about culture clash and culture shock, art, rituals and traditions (Wetherell & Potter 1992:129-131). This understanding of culture as a source of conflict and clashes can be said to resemble the formulation of culture as a barrier in extract 30 (Colombia). 'Culture as therapy' on the other hand describes an understanding of culture as an individual right and necessity – something that is linked to identity, values, roots and pride (Ibid.:131-34). This understanding is emphasising culture as a positive thing that defines the individual's uniqueness, and in this sense it resembles the understanding of culture as resource which is formulated in extract 31 (Music and Dancing).

When comparing the two extracts from this interview and considering them in relation to the findings of Potter & Wetherell, one can tentatively say that the general understanding of

culture as an absolute entity that determines individual action, which seemed to be reproduced in the two extracts, finds its unique expression in two different interpretative repertoires, namely 'culture as barrier' and 'culture as resource'.

These can be defined by their opposition, and the way they are applied in relation to different conversational functions and contexts. As we can see, the interpretative repertoire 'culture as resource' is used in the second extract in relation to a positive assessment of the cultural 'baggage' that IN is associated with. The conversational context for this extract is the previous positive announcement by HO about the assessment of IN as a possible intern. Alternatively the repertoire 'culture as barrier' is used in the first extract in relation to a negative assessment of IN's cultural background and her experience from Colombia, and the conversational context was in this case a discussion of the internship's short duration being a problem. This difference in the function and context of the use of the two different formulations of culture indicate that different interpretative repertoires can be used as resources in different lines of argumentation, in this case, respectively for and against the making of an internship agreement.

The interpretative repertoires 'culture as barrier' and 'culture as resource' are also manifested in some of the other internship interviews. The following extract, which is an example of this, is taken from a follow-up internship interview with a woman from Iran, who is in the middle of her internship at a residential home. Previous to the extract she has told the other participants that this is the first time she has worked with Danes, and in the beginning of the extract she is telling the others about how she has experienced this.

Extract 32: Hierarchy

53 (0.4)
54 IN: .h altså hvordan de snakker med fo:lk og
55 .h that is how they talk with people and
56
57 IN: .hh altså: (.) de er meget venligere i: end
58 .hh that is: (.) they are much friendlier in: than
59
60 IN: i mit land synes jeg
61 in my country I think
62 (0.3)
63 CO: >meget meget< hvad
64 >much much< what
65
66 IN: venlig
67 friendly
68 (0.4)
69 CO: venlig.
70 friendly
71
72 IN: ja
73 yes
74
75 CO: ja
76 yes
77 (0.4)
78 () [å:]
79
80 HO: [så:] så der er mere .h mere hierarki der hvor du kommer fra.
81 [so:] so there is more .h more hierchy where you come from.
82
83 HO: .h altså .h høj taler ikke med lav og sådan [alts]å de- e-
84 .h that is .h high does not talk with low and that [that i]s the- e
85 IN: [ja]
86 [yes]
87 HO: sådn- rent [sta]tsmæssigt .hh hvis man e:r er .h LEDEr ikke
88 like- [sta]tuswise .hh if one i:s is .h LEADER right
89 IN: [ja]
90 [yes]
91 IN: j[a]
92 y[es]
93 HO: [stig] eller [JEG eller] vi taler ikke med dig.
94 [stig] or [I or] we don't talk with you
95 IN: [DER ER SÅdan]
96 [THERE IS LIKE]
97 (.)
98 IN: n[ej]
99 n[o]
100 HO: [hvor du] nej okay så[dan] ja
101 [where you] no okay li[ke] that yes
102 IN: [nej]
103 [no]
104 HO: ja.=
105 yes.=
106
107 IN: =arj [sådan] lederen sidder bare å så de- si[ger ba]re
108 =no [like] the leader just sit and then the- ju[st say]
109 HO: [.hja] [ja]
110 [yhes] [yes]
111
112 HO: *ja det ku jeg også tænke mig*
113 *yes that I could also imagine*
114
115 IN: =ja=
116 =yes=
117
118 HO: =*ja*
119 =*yes*
120

Here culture is made relevant by IN in relation to a positive description of Danish culture. IN describes Danes as much friendlier than people in her home country, and HO responds to this by expanding on the herein implicit negative assessment of IN's home country by describing it as hierarchical. HO, in other words, uses IN's concrete description of Danes as friendlier (than Iranians) to make a more general and abstract characterisation of the Iranian social structure, which was not initially the focus of IN's description.

This extract is very similar to extract 30 (Colombia), since HO also here draws on a traditional understanding of culture and uses the interpretative repertoire ‘culture as barrier’ as a tool for the construction of a valorised opposition between Danish values and ‘foreign’ values. In this extract, this negative assessment and opposition is, however, not as problematic for the candidate as the first extract, since the conversational context in this extract is the candidate’s experience of the Danes rather than the employer’s assessment of the candidate’s professional background and experience, which was the context in the first extract. Since the candidate initially makes a positive assessment of Danes in relation to Iranians, she dissociates herself from Iranians in general and hereby from HO’s supplementary characteristic of the Iranian system. The three extracts can, however still, be said to indicate a systematic in the way in which ‘culture as barrier’ is used in the descriptions of the candidate’s meeting with a Danish work-place. The repertoire ‘culture as resource’ is alternatively used in relation to a recognition of the applicant’s competences, which the following extract exemplifies.

Extract 32: Tradition

330 CO: det fordi hun har også været på besøg hos andre plejehjem og
 331 der har hun så talt om .hh at øøhm at fordi at hun kommer
 332 fra Iran og man har en tradition [for] og [passe og pleje og
 333 respektere ældre mennesker
 334
 335 it's because she has also been visiting other residential homes and
 336 there was she then talked about .hh that eehm that because she comes
 337 from Iran and one has a tradition [for] and [ta]lking care of and
 338 respecting elderly people
 339 HO: [ja]
 340 [yes]
 341 (HO/EM:) [ja]
 342 [yes]
 343 IN: [ja]
 344 [yes]
 345 HO: [ja] ja
 346 [yes] yes
 347
 348 CO: så tror hun at hun kan bruge det (.) i sit arbejde
 349 Then she thinks that she can use it (.) in her work
 350
 351 HO: ja:t
 352 ye:s
 353
 354 CO: på et plejehjem
 355 in a residential home
 356
 357 HO: ja
 358 yes
 359
 360 CO: med den
 361 with the
 362
 363 HO: ja
 364 yes
 365
 366 CO: [den] [den kul]turelle [led] [ik]
 367 [the] [the cul]tural [way] [right]
 368 HO: [ja] [j:at] [ja] [.hh] ja
 369 [yes] [ye:s] [yes] [.hh] yes

Although it seems from this extract that it is CO who makes tradition and later culture relevant, it is in fact IN who has previously introduced the tradition of looking after elders in her home-country when accounting for her qualifications. This account is triggered by a question from

HO about whether she has thought about the fact that the job as a caregiver involves helping the elders getting washed, go to the bathroom and eat. IN thus employs the ‘culture as resource’ repertoire as part of the argument that she believes to have some competences or insight by the mere fact that there is a tradition in her home-country for looking after and respecting the elders. CO is in this part of the extract merely responding to and supporting this argumentation by making a formulation of IN’s argument. HO responds to this by showing acknowledgement and strong confirmation, first by using raised pitch in line 351 and later by giving affirmative responses to the elaborations offered by CO in line 357, 363 and finally 368 where CO has summarized IN’s point as ‘den kulturelle led’ (‘the cultural way’). While IN initially introduced the notion of ‘tradition’ and linked it with the category of nationality, CO is supporting this linking and defining it as ‘culture’, and in this way they both contribute to making culture relevant and in doing this use the repertoire ‘culture as resource’ as a means of argumentation for the competence and preparedness of the candidate.

5.3.2 Summary

The two examples presented in this first part of the analysis reveal various similarities in the ways in which membership categories related to nationality are made relevant. In both cases, the nationalities of the candidates are made relevant by describing a range of practices, norms, and ‘ways’ of doing things within a specific professional field, which is then linked to a specific national context, namely Denmark. These descriptions are implicitly contrasting a cultural other, which is associated with the candidate and made relevant by orienting to the candidate’s situated identity as a ‘learner’ and a ‘newcomer,’ both with regards to the place of employment and Denmark. The candidates are, in both examples, constructed as workplace interns and cultural interns, and the experience they have from working within the same or similar professions in their home countries are treated as more of a disadvantage than an advantage.

In the first example the entire negotiation about the Colombian versus the Danish kindergarten follows directly from a talk about the candidate’s previous work-experience, which is hereby potentially challenged or undermined. In the second example, the employer has just mentioned how she specifically will not be able to teach the candidate anything professionally, hereby making his professional qualifications and experience relevant, and this then leads to an extended descriptions of what she can teach him, namely the former mentioned ‘ways’ and practices of farming and trading at the Orchard and in Denmark. In both

examples, specific professional skills, qualifications and experiences are contrasted with more abstract and general practices, 'ways' and 'systems,' and the former is backgrounded and the latter fore-grounded. I would argue that this makes it difficult for the candidate to represent themselves as competent, experienced and professional, since the practices, norms and ways that are associated with the Danish context are only defined in abstract, general terms, if at all, and therefore difficult for the candidate to relate and respond to, as well as agree or disagree with.

It is clear from the analysis that the consequences for the future development of the interaction are highly dependent on the participation and the co-construction of the candidate and the employer. In the first example, the extensive and elaborated participation of the candidate, allows the candidate to challenge the relevance of culture by emphasizing cultural similarity rather than difference. In the second example, however, the participation of the candidate is minimal and is at no point engaging with the employer's construction of the practices of farming and trading as something nationally and 'culturally' specific. This is not to say that in the second example there is no co-construction taking place. Both examples show the co-construction of cultural membership, but in the second example the co-construction of the candidate consists only of affirmative and acknowledging utterances, and the topical development and the distribution of turns is to a much greater extent given over to and left in the hands of the employer.

So far, the analysis has shown that membership categories related to nationality are interactional achievements that are informed by and interrelate with the participants' orientations towards other membership categories related to the participation framework and the speech situation of the internship interview. Furthermore, it has been shown and argued that the establishment and orientation towards the category nationality illuminate a pattern in the way they are informed by understandings of 'culture' as a system of thought, values and action. Thus, constructions of nationality seem to imply culture, which is never defined but associated with general terms such as 'ways' and 'systems' of thought and action. Finally, it was demonstrated and argued that categories related to nationality are constituted through processes of difference and deferral from the membership category 'Danish,' and that the internship candidate is excluded from this category and encouraged to in various ways acquire the actions, behaviour and value associated with it.

5.4 How are Categories Related to ‘Language’ made Relevant?

In all of the internship interviews, categories related to language, or more specifically the linguistic background and competence of the candidates, were made relevant by one or more of the participants and in 61 % of the total number of cases, it was either the employer or the employee who brought it up. In many cases this was done explicitly by the participants in various ways addressing the language background of the internship candidate or orienting to the membership category of second language speaker. These are the cases that will be examined in this section. Furthermore, there are cases within the various interviews where the category of second language speaker can be said to be established and made relevant in a more implicit manner through the use of conversational techniques such as simplification that can also be observed in interactions with other learner groups such as children. These cases will not be explored in this dissertation, since they in different ways hinge on more linguistic forms of analysis that are not within the theoretical and analytical scope proposed here.

The orientation towards the category second language speaker could in some cases be said to be related to the behaviour of the candidate that were at times minimal or oriented to as non-standard by the other participants. In other cases it was related to the question of the candidate's perceived or experienced ability to undertake the tasks required by him or her as part of the internship. In some of these cases a conceptual link seemed to be at play between the notion of linguistic and cultural competence. In this section, I will look at how the category second-language speaker is made relevant, what the consequences are, and not least how it is dealt with interactionally by the participants.

The first couple of examples examined are cases where the category of second language speaker is made relevant in relation to an assessment and establishment by the other participants of the candidate's linguistic competence and proficiency as a Danish speaker. This projects a response from the candidate and initiates a topical excursion which has to be dealt with in order for the interaction can proceed again. The first example is from an interview with a candidate from Iraq, who is thirty years old, has been in Denmark for ten years and is being interviewed for an internship at a residential home. She has no previous training or professional work experience within this field from either Denmark or Iraq, but is planning to enter a training program preparing her for this kind of care-taking upon completing the internship. The extract begins with HO describing his experience with this training program.

Extract 33: Do you understand what I'm saying?

13 CO: Du kender det godt ik os stig
 14 You do know it right Stig
 15 (0.4)
 16 CO: Det s- det det det grundforløb deri på skolen
 17 That s- that that that basic course therei in the school
 18
 19 HO: .hh jeg [kender] jo: jeg kender lidt til det
 20 .hh I [know] yes: I know a little about it
 21 CO: [ja]
 22 [yes]
 23
 24 HO: jeg [kender] det jeg [kender] det ikke vældigt godt
 25 I [know] it I don't [know] it very well
 26 CO: [ja] [ja]
 27 [yes] [yes]
 28 (.)
 29 IN: o: [kay]
 30 o: [kay]
 31 HO: [men øh jeg kender lidt til det
 32 [but eh I know a little about it
 33
 34 IN: °ja°
 35 °yes°
 36
 37 HO: ja
 38 yes
 39 (0.5)
 40 HO: øh og når jeg siger jeg kender lidt til det så er det fordi
 41 øøh .hhh jeg kend- jeg har sådan set studieordningen og f- og
 42 v- kender sådan teorien i det kan man sige ik
 43
 44 Eh and when I say I know a little about it then it is because ehh
 45 .hhh I know- I have you know seen the study description and f- and
 46 v- know sort of the theory of it you could say right
 47
 48 IN: °o: [kay°
 49 °o: [kay°
 50 HO: [.hh øh [og] så har vi e- en øh en øh: en i praktik
 51 [.hh eh [and] then we have s- someone eh someone eh: as an intern
 52 IN: [nå]
 53 [oh]
 54
 55 HO: her øh som .hh som er på det særlige grundforløb
 56 here eh who .hh who is doing the special basiccourse
 57 IN: °Nå ['kay°
 58 °oh [right°
 59 HO: [så]
 60 [so]
 61
 62 HO: me[n det] men det [de- det] den erf- det den erfaring
 63 bu[t that] but that [th- that] is the expe- that's the experience
 64 IN: [det godt] [heh. he.]
 65 [that's good] [heh. he.]
 66
 67 HO: jeg har med det så det jo ikke meget
 68 I have with it so that (you know) is not much
 69
 70 IN: °ja°
 71 °yes°
 72 (.)
 73 HO: .hh [nej] .hh er det svært f- øh kan du forstå
 74 .hh [no] .hh is it difficult f- eh can you understand
 75 IN: ['kay]
 76 [right]
 77
 78 HO: hvad jeg siger
 79 what I am saying
 80
 81 IN: fJA|AAf
 82 fYE|ESf
 83
 84 HO: >fDet godt f<
 85 >fThat's good f<
 86
 87 IN: h[hundrede procent heh. heh. he. jah.] [heh. heh. .hhhh]
 88 h[hundred percent heh. heh. he. jah.] [heh. heh. .hhhh]
 89 HO: [heh. heh. he. he. he.]
 90 [heh. heh. he. he. he.]
 91
 92 CO: [Laika er god til dansk]
 93 [Laika is good at Danish]

In this example the linguistic competence and thereby background of IN is made relevant by HO in line 74 where he shows that he interprets IN's previous responses as a display of not understanding. Looking at these responses, they seem fairly minimal, and although they cannot generally be said to be non-responsive or show direct displays of non-understanding, there are aspects about some of her utterances that could be indicating problems of understanding. Her first response is in line 29, where she says 'okay' at a Transition Relevant Place in HO's previous utterance. This indicates that he has finished his turn. HO overlaps the second half of IN's 'okay' and initiates another turn where he says that he knows a little about the program.

At this point, IN gives her second response, 'yes' in line 34, which is uttered in a lower voice than her previous one and followed by an acknowledgement by HO, namely 'yes', followed by a 0.5 second pause. Here, IN could have taken the floor but does not, which leads HO to elaborate his previous claim of knowledge about the program in line 36. He does not provide the actual knowledge he has about the program but rather his reasons for having this knowledge, and IN responds to this with a second 'okay' in line 48, uttered in low voice. This response also occurs at a Transition Relevant Place, since the last Turn Construction Unit in HO's previous utterance is completed and again HO overlaps the final half of IN's 'okay' in line 50 and supplies one more reason for having some knowledge about the program.

IN overlaps this final account with an 'oh' in line 52, which would normally work as an acknowledgement token and a prompt for HO to continue. The placement is, however, a little off; it is slightly delayed as a response to the previous utterance, and slightly early to relate to the ongoing utterance, considering that HO has not yet supplied any additional information, but merely taken an in-breath and said 'eh'. This could therefore be seen as the first indication of a problem of understanding.

After HO has finished his turn in line 55, IN however, after a 0.2 second pause, supplies another 'oh' followed directly by a 'kay', which can be seen as a follow-up and correction of the previous, prematurely placed, 'oh', and this displays understanding, although it is once again uttered in low voice. Once more, HO overlaps the second half of her 'nå 'kay', this time with a 'so', which indicates that HO has finished his turn and is giving the floor to the other participants, and he continues immediately with a closing utterance in line 63-68 that summarizes his previous turns. IN overlaps this closing utterance in line 65 with 'that's good' and some laughter which can be said to display orientation to HO's previous 'so' and its projection of a closing.

After HO has finished this utterance in line 68, she says 'ja' which does not represent the right response to the final part of his utterance, namely 'so that is not so much'. This should rather have been responded to with a 'no'. While IN's previous responses in low voice are ambiguous as displays of non-understanding, this final yes is a less ambiguous display of language difficulty because the previous utterance by HO in line 68 has projected a confirmation with negative, not a positive, polarity. HO responds to and repairs this mistake in line 74 by supplying the right response, 'no, at the beginning of his next utterance, immediately following an in-breath.

When analyzing IN's responses one by one, it is clear that there are aspects of them that make them interpretable and understandable as displaying problems of understanding. However, when disregarding the contextual knowledge about IN's language background and her slight accent, some of these aspects, namely the low voice and the minimal responses, can also be interpreted as a normal degree of hesitation and withholding, which indicates an orientation towards IN's role as interviewee and internship candidate and HO's role as interviewer and potential employer. They can, in other words, be seen as an orientation towards the contextual circumstances and the speech event, rather than a product and result of a transportable identity as second-language speaker.

Regardless of whether we as analysts interpret IN's previous responses and back channelling as weak or standard, HO illustrates by his utterance in line 64 that he interprets her actions as a display of not understanding, and most importantly he chooses to solve this problem by asking IN directly if it is difficult for her to understand him. This question can be seen as highly challenging, especially considering that IN's previous contributions are in fact ambiguous and are not clearly displaying non-understanding. If IN had been a native-speaker of Danish, it seems unlikely that this approach would have been used by HO, however ambiguous and weak IN's responses might have been. My suggestion is that HO uses the contextual knowledge locally available to him such as IN's accent, her appearance, his knowledge about the purpose of the internship and previous utterances to make the category second language speaker relevant. Hereby HO is accounting for and co-constructing IN's previous actions as non-standard and problematic.

In the following example the category of second-language speaker is made relevant in a very similar way, but here the candidate has been markedly absent in the immediately previous

turns, although this has not been the case previously in the interview. This absence can be said to invoke the question which follows regarding her understanding. The interviewee is a female candidate from Morocco, who has been in Denmark for eighteen years, where she has worked in hotel kitchens mostly. She is now being interviewed for an internship as an assistant cook in a government funded project for homeless people in Copenhagen.

The extract is taken from the middle of the interview, as opposed to the previous example which was taken from the very beginning of the interview. Previously in the interview the employee has welcomed the candidate and has given an elaborate description of the workplace and the work-routines that the candidate will be taking part in, namely the preparing of the food for the homeless. During this initial part of the interaction, the employer has indirectly addressed the candidate by using the pronoun ‘you’ but has not directly requested or invited a response. Nevertheless the candidate has been displaying understanding throughout the employers and the employees descriptions by means of minimal responses such as ‘yes’, ‘mm’, ‘mhm’ and by asking probing questions once in a while.

At this point in the interview, CO has just explained the importance of having a serious content and purpose of the internship, and HO has responded by explaining how they see the internship developing from smaller tasks to larger tasks.

Extract 34: Do you understand?

23 -- -
 24 EM: [altså] vi har jo af erfaring (.) altså- lægger vi småt ud fordi
 25 [that is] we have from experience (.) I mean- we begin small because
 26
 27 altså- [vi har jo erfaring for at .hh
 28 I mean-[we have experienced that .hh
 29
 30 (CO:) [()]
 31 CO: °ja°=
 32 °yea°=
 33
 34 EM: =at det andet de:t altså hvis vi lægger for hårdt ud fra
 35 =that the other i:t that is if we start off too hard from
 36
 37 starten så- så: det tit det vælter ik
 38 the beginning then- the:n often it falls over right
 39
 40 CO: ja
 41 yes
 42
 43 HO: mm
 44 mm
 45
 46 EM: °altså°
 47 °that is°
 48
 49 CO: Er du med (.) forstå- forstår du
 50 Do you follow (.) do you- do you understand
 51
 52 IN: ja
 53 yes
 54
 55 CO: ja
 56 yes

The formatting of the question that makes the linguistic background and competences of the candidate relevant is similar in this extract and the previous one in the sense that in both cases it is formatted as a direct question, namely ‘do you understand?’ However, there are also certain differences in the formatting that may influence the function of the question and the response it receives. In the first extract the question is more elaborate and includes two questions namely ‘is it difficult?’ and ‘do you understand?’ and here the object of understanding is specified by ‘what I’m saying’, which indicates that the question concerns the speaking of HO. In this second extract, on the other hand, the question is formatted more openly, both with regards to the first and the second question asked, namely ‘do you follow’ and ‘do you understand’.

Contrary to the first extract, these two questions do not point to the previous speech as such as a potential problem, but more generally inquire whether the candidate is following what is going on and being talked about. In this extract, the question is furthermore posed by the job-consultant and not the previous speaker, EM – this supports the interpretation that the function of the question is more of a general inclusion of the candidate into the context and activity of the interaction, rather than a specific inquiry about the candidate’s level of linguistic competence.

The fact that it is the job-consultant and not the employer or the employee who inquires about the understanding of the candidate can be said to illustrate the way that an orientation towards memberships categories related to the speech situation interrelate with orientations towards other membership categories. As mentioned in section 2.1.2, 2.2.1 and 2.2.2, the role of the job-consultant in relation to providing the job-counselling, setting up the interview, and not least taking part in the interview influences the participation framework and the speech situation in the sense that they themselves and the other participants are orienting to and constructing their role as mediators between the different parties and advocates for the candidate. This orientation can be said to be manifested in the act of checking or making sure that the candidate is following what is going on and hereby inviting her response and participation.

Returning to the differences in the formatting of the question ‘Do you understand?’ in the two examples, they seem to result in a difference in the function of the question, which projects different answers from the candidates, and this is also reflected in the different responses that follow. In the first extract, the candidate responds very emphatically in line 82

to the implied suggestion that she does not understand what HO has been saying, hereby displaying that she has understood the question as an implied negative assessment, which has to be countered or proven wrong. In her response she is orienting to the asymmetry that the question entails in the sense that by using emphasis and loud voice she is being assertive, rather than merely responsive. This can be heard as a criticism of the preceding question and projects that some sort of excuse, account or explanation for HO's question is to follow. At the same time, the assertiveness is done in a smile voice, which mitigates the implied criticism and rejection. Although HO does not explicitly respond by giving an excuse or account, he orients to the assertiveness and the rejection by giving a quick satisfied third turn response in line 85, also in smile voice. Hereby he is at once diminishing the negative thrust of his previous question and closing the topic on a good note.

In the second extract, on the other hand, the candidate orients to the question in line 52 as if it was merely making sure that she is following the conversational content. and it is in no way emphatically marked, which This is also illustrated by the following response of CO in line 55 who merely acknowledges that IN has understood rather than, as in the first extract, supporting IN by giving an account. After IN's confirmation that she has understood, IN continues in line 58 by describing what she is and is not able to do during the internship, and hereby she addresses what was initially addressed by HO, before CO's question. In other words, she not only claims understanding in response to HO's question, but also displays understanding by returning to the topic of discussion, namely the amount and complexity of the tasks of the internship, and the expectations and concerns of HO and EM.

Although there are differences in the function and the uptake of the question 'do you understand', the two examples are similar in the way the question, 'do you understand' makes the linguistic competence and hereby background of the candidate potentially relevant. In the first extract, this is more clearly so, since the question here is less ambiguously posed and responded to, but in both extracts the question of understanding makes the linguistic background of the candidate relevant. Another similarity between the two examples is the way the category second-language speaker is inserted into the general topical development of the interaction as a temporary check-up on the candidate's understanding of what is going on linguistically or topically. These two examples, in other words, show how the category of second-language speaker is made relevant in relation to an interactionally embedded establishment of the candidate's level of linguistic proficiency and competence.

While the contributions of the two candidates in the first two examples, as described, can be said to come off as weak or at least very minimal, this does not fully explain why the employer and the job-consultant choose to inquire about the level of understanding. In both cases, there are aspects about the situation of this inquiry that reveal the influence of the internship interview as a specific speech situation and the broader context in which this speech situation is embedded. As discussed in section 2.2.2, the speech situation is characterized by having been set up by a job-consultant as part of a job-counselling program for people with an ethnic minority background. Although we cannot say for sure how the internship or the interview have been arranged and described between the job-consultant and the employer prior to the interview, it is probably safe to say that the employer has been informed about the ethnic minority background of the candidate prior to the interview and most probably the issue of language has already been mentioned or discussed. This knowledge can be said to evoke a range of interpretative repertoires that can be said to influence the interpretations and the actions of the employer as well as the job-consultant and should be taken into consideration when trying to answer the question of ‘why that now’ with respect to the employer’s question to the candidate in the first example.

The following examples of interviews where the category of second-language speaker are made relevant are different from the previous ones in the sense that they are not addressing or checking the linguistic competence, proficiency and understanding of the candidate. Rather, they seem to make the category of second-language speaker relevant as a topic in its own right, either indirectly latched on a discussion of another topic, or directly as a topic in its own right which is opened up for discussion. The contexts in which this occurs seem to be more marginal points in the interaction where the central aspects of the internship have already been discussed, and where the participants have moved on to discuss the details of the future internship and summarize what the internship will involve, offer and demand.

The first example, which was presented previously in section 5.3, is from an interview at an orchard with a male candidate from Somalia. The extract takes place in the very end of the interaction, at a point where the employer has shown the candidate the entire orchard and is now mentioning the possibility of also trying to spend some time in the orchard store, which she is in charge of.

Extract 25: Danish (repeated extract)

73 HO: Men jeg kan give dig en fornemmelse af (0.6) hvad der sker
74 But I can give you a sense of (0.6) what happens
75 (0.8)
76 HO: Hvad det er vi lægger vægt på og hvordan vi gerne vil (0.2) øøh
77 ha' vores produkter
78
79 what it is we emphasize and how we would like to have (0.2)
80 eeh our products
81
82 IN: mm=
83 HO: =øøh vores butiksform
84 =eeh our way of the store
85 (0.6)
86 HO: Du kommer i kontakt
87 You will be in contact
88 (0.2)
89 IN: ja=
90 Yea=
91
92 HO: =hvis du kommer ind til mig i butikken her så har du kontakt
93 med nogle [kunder] nogle der taler dansk
94
95 =if you come with me in the store here you have contact
96 with some [clients] some that speak Danish
97
98 IN: [ja]
99 [yes]
100 (0.4)
101 IN: ja=
102 yes=

Here, the linguistic competence and background of the candidate are not made relevant in the same direct way as in the previous examples and not in relation to a question of understanding. Instead, it is introduced as a side-remark in line 92 during a discussion of what the candidate can learn or experience during the internship. The category of second-language speaker is introduced here as a specific dimension of the internship, and not as an issue of understanding related to the ongoing interaction as such.

The category of second-language speaker is not, as in the two previous examples, made relevant directly, but is rather introduced indirectly by means of the *consistency rule* (see section 5.3) as described by Sacks. That is through the mentioning of another category, namely Danish-speaker, within the same overall Membership Categorization Device, which in this case would be language-speakers. By making it relevant that the customers in the store would be someone who speaks Danish, Danish-speakers, it is the fact that the candidate does not speak Danish, or speaks Danish as a second-language, is made relevant indirectly. As demonstrated earlier in the analysis of how nationality is made relevant, nationality is made relevant by the employer's descriptions of the orchard and by her use of the pronoun *we*, which simultaneously indexes the people on the farm and a wider group of Danes or Danish farmers. This can be said to furnish the conversational context for making the linguistic background of the customers relevant. However, when looking at the interaction in terms of the distribution of

turns and the contributions of the participants, there are other factors which can be said to contribute to this furnishing.

As in extract 34 (Do you understand?), the distribution of turns has been highly asymmetrical in the sense that the employer and the employee respectively have been the ones dominating the interaction by giving elaborate descriptions of the work-place and the tasks that will constitute the internship. In this sense they have oriented to and co-constructed the speech event as primarily an informative and instructional event rather than an interview and have hereby given the candidate little opportunity or encouragement to participate or contribute. During these two interviews the candidate was asked very few direct questions, and the few questions that were in fact asked were often closed questions that did not require or encourage much elaboration. Consequently, the contribution and the participation of the candidates were in both cases minimal, but more so in the second case (Extract 25: Danish) than in the first (Do you understand?). As we see, the candidate's contributions in extract 25 (Danish) consist mostly of 'mm' and 'yes', whereas in extract 33 (Do you understand what I'm saying?), the candidate is saying 'okay' and 'yes'.

In extract 34 (Do you understand?) the employer's interpretation of the candidates participation is based on very few turns, since the question 'do you understand' is posed right in the beginning of the interaction. In this latest example (Extract 25: Danish) however, the category of second-language speaker is made relevant right at the end of the interaction, and any interpretation or inference that the employer might have made as a basis for introducing this category is therefore based on a much longer history of participation of the candidate. When looking at the candidate's contributions previous to the extract, there seems to be a fair basis for evaluating it as minimal and even to an extent where it could be interpreted as non-standard. It should be said, though, that this interview is different from the others in that it consists of a tour around the orchard from beginning to end, and the main activity taking place is therefore that of the employer introducing the orchard and describing the work-routines. Consequently, the candidate can be said to merely orient to this introductory and descriptive format of the interaction by acknowledging what he is being shown with acknowledgement tokens that are perhaps minimal but appropriate. The candidate not only shows orientation to the tour-guiding format, but also at times attempts to fulfil the minimal participatory potential of it by asking supplementary questions regarding the information he is given. However, in some of these cases the questions demonstrate a lack of understanding of what has been

explained or shown, rather than displaying understanding. The following extract, which takes place right at the beginning of the tour, is an example of this:

Extract 35: Plastic

12 HO: O:g som du kan se der er gjort klar til vinteren
 13 A:nd as you can see there has been made ready for winter
 14 (0.9)
 15 HO: (klippet) ned
 16 (cut) down
 17 (0.7)
 18 IN: mm
 19 HO: Og lagt den lidt og blev ø::h lagt i sort
 20 plastik for at beskytte
 21 HO: And laid it a little and was e::h laid in black
 22 plastic to protect
 23 (0.8)
 24 HO: øh for sol og regn
 25 eh for sun and rain
 26 (1.0)
 27 HO: så det sådan når vi ska bruge (.) plastikket
 28 til næste år så pakker vi det ud (0.3)
 29 og trækker det på igen (.) og det er så for
 30 [for]
 31 HO: So it is like that when we will ne:ed (.) the plastic
 32 next year so we unpack it (0.3)
 33 and pull it over again (.) and that is then to
 34 [to]
 35 IN: [hvis jeg kommer: e:hm (0.8) vinter (0.2)
 36 eh (0.7) (kuffal det)
 37 IN: [If I come e:hm (0.8) winter (0.2)
 38 eh (0.7) (kuffal it)
 39 (0.6)
 40 HO: ja
 41 yes
 42 (0.4)
 43 HO: Ikke om vinteren nej
 44 Not in winter no
 45 (0.5)
 46 IN: [°nej°]
 47 [°no°]
 48 HO: [til] sommer hhe. (0.2)
 49 [in] summer hhe. (0.2)
 50 IN: til sommer okay=
 51 in summer okay=
 52 HO: =til foråret. for at give dem va:rme
 53 =in spring. to give them he:at
 54 IN: mm

In this extract HO is explaining and demonstrating the practice of covering up some of the crop, and the candidate initially responds to this in line 18 with an mm. After an elaboration by the employer of the function and management of the plastic used for this practice, IN asks a supplementary question in line 35, which however demonstrates a misunderstanding about the time of the practice of covering. He says ‘if I come e:hm winter’ followed by something unclear, and this conjunctive construction projects either an affirmative or negative response from HO.

HO first responds to this in line 40 by supplying the continuer ‘yes.’ However, after a pause she provides a correction in line 43 ‘not in winter no’, showing that she understands IN’s utterance as a formulation or summary of what she has previously explained, and she is correcting this formulation while identifying the season as the problem source. IN responds to this repair initiation with ‘no’, spoken in low voice. This ‘no’ is overlapped by HO, who now provides the right answer ‘in summer’ in smile voice, which can be said to orient to the

misunderstanding. IN acknowledges the misunderstanding in his next response by repeating and hereby aligning with HO, who then finally clarifies and elaborates her previous correction by saying ‘in spring to give them heat’ in line 52. By giving this final elaboration IN supplies not only the right season but points at the central aspect of the issue with the plastic, namely the covering up of the crops in order to give them heat and not the other practice related to this, which is putting away the plastic for winter, which was assumingly what she was suggesting in the first utterance.

The problem in this extract could be said to stem from first the indirect pointing to a practice by the first utterance in line 12 ‘as you can see there has been made ready for winter’ which does not specify what exactly IN is to notice, the plastic being put away or the plastic being ready to use for the covering up. This is made increasingly unclear by the following utterance in line 19, where HO talks about ‘protecting’ but not specifying whether it is the plastic or the crops that should be protected. In the following line 27, HO specifies that she is talking about the plastic, which should be ready for the covering next year, but at this point there is no specification of when the covering takes place. At this point then, it is unclear whether the crops are covered or uncovered during winter, and this is the issue IN can be said to probe further with his utterance in line 35.

When looking at the contributions of HO which are characterized by indirectness and a lack of specificity around the practice of covering up the crops and putting away the plastic, the probing utterance by IN in line 35 seems interactionally relevant and appropriate. Furthermore, the misunderstanding it displays appears less related to problems with understanding language and more related to problems with understanding a given explanation of a practice. However, this extract can, as first mentioned, be regarded as a situation in which the candidate shows problems with speaking Danish, due to the misunderstanding as such and the way it is centered around an formulation made by IN, which not only shows a problem with understanding what HO has previously said but is also formatted as an incomplete conditional construction with part of the wording being hardly understandable.

The extract in this way presents an example of a situation in the interaction where the category of second-language speaker is made potentially relevant by the participation of the candidate and hereby furnishes the conversational context for the specific topicalisation that occurs later in the interview and was illustrated in extract 25 (Danish). It should be noted however, as argued by Brown (Brown 2003), that the language ability and level of proficiency

displayed by the candidate should not be considered an individual property, but rather the product of a joint construction between the employer and the internship candidate.

In her study of language testing, Brown argues that interviewer behaviour is directly implicational for the construction of the candidates' proficiency. A similar result is found by Christina Fogtmann, who has studied naturalization interviews between Danish police representatives and Danish second-language speakers applying for Danish citizenship. She argues that although the assessment of the applicants is related to their lexicogrammatic level of performance, the participation and behaviour of the applicants is highly related to and influenced by the interactional behaviour of the police representatives (Fogtmann 2007:290).

The mentioning of these studies of the co-constructed nature of proficiency emphasize the importance of studying the participation and behaviour of second-language speakers, and first-language speakers for that matter, as jointly constructed rather than as reflections of individual abilities and competences. This is not to suggest that the orientation of the employer towards the candidate from Somalia as a second-language speaker is not valid, but rather to emphasize the employer's role in generating or producing the minimal or non-standard behaviour of the candidate, which can be said to inspire this orientation. While this dimension of proficiency as co-constructed is beyond the scope of this thesis and will not be explored further, it is important to bear in mind in relation to the question of how, when and why categories related to language are made relevant and oriented to by the employers.

The following extract is another example of the category of second-language speaker being addressed as a topic in its own right, and as in the extract 25 (Danish) it is related to an implicit assessment of the candidates' language competences as less than proficient, or non-standard. This example differs, however, from extract 25 (Danish) by being addressed directly rather than indirectly. In this respect, it is similar to the first two examples, although the category in those examples was evoked in relation to a local issue of understanding and not a topic in its own right.

Extract 28: So You Both Have to Learn Danish? (Repeated extract)

13 EM: Er din mand også fra I:ran, (very thouroughly prc
14 Is your husband also from I:ran
15
16 IN: ja
17 yes
18
19 EM: ja
20 yes
21
22 IN: ja=
23 yes=
24
25 EM: =[.tsk]
26 =[.tsk]
27
28 () [.hja]
29 [.h]yeah
30
31 EM: Så skal I begge [to lære fdanskf? =
32 So you both have [to learn fDanishf?=
33
34 IN: [han kommer (ja/her)=
35 [he comes (yes/here)=
36
37 EM: =[sk.ha] [()]=
38 =[sk.ha] [()]=
39
40 IN: =[ja] ha ha [ha]=
41 =[yes]ha ha [ha]=
42
43 CO: =[Nej han har]boet her i mange år.
44 =[no he has] lived here for many years
45
46 IN: =[ja::]
47 =[ye::s
48
49 EM: Nå han har [boet her i mange år okay]
50 Oh he has [lived here for many years okay]
51
52 (CO/IN:) [ja () også] boet [her]
53 [yes() also] lived [here]
54
55 EM: [ja] ja
56 [yes] yes
57 (0.3)
58 IN: .shll (makes a sort of slurping sound)
59 .shll
60
61 HO: Så må i tale dansk hjemme,
62 So you must be speaking Danish at home,
63
64 (0.3)
65
66 IN: °Nej°
67 °No°
68
69 (0.4)
70

71 HO: Det skal i gøre (high pitch)
72 You have to
73
74 (0.2)
75
76 IN: Persisk h. hi hi [hi (jheg skhal)] thale mhed pher[shisk)
77 Persian h. he he [he (i musth)] spreak whith Pher[shian)
78
79 HO: [ja:e]
80 [ye:a
81 CO: [Man taler nok
82 [One probably
83
84 [det sprog] man [har lettest ved]
85 speaks [the language] one [is most comfortable with]
86
87 IN: [JAAE hah.] [DET SVÆRT for mig]
88 [JEAA hah.] [IT IS HARD FOR ME]
89
90 HO: Det gør man nok men man skal nok indimellem gøre det for at træne
91 ik?
92 One probably does but one should probably do it once in a while to
93 practice right?
94
95 IN: Men øh min datter taler øh fi:nt dansk og også taler fint persisk.
96 But eh my daughter speaks eh go:od Danish and also speaks good
97 Persian.
98
99 EM: ja det j[o g]odt
100 well that [is go]od
101
102 HO: [ja]
103 [ves]

In this example, the category of second-language speaker is made relevant by EM in line 31, as an inference from the category ‘Iranian’. Learning Danish is constructed as an activity which is bound to the category ‘Iranian,’ and the activity of learning Danish implies that it is something one does not know to begin with and hereby the category ‘second-language speaker’ is made relevant and linked to the category ‘Iranian’. The implication of EM’s utterance in line 31 is thus similar to the implication ‘some that speak Danish’ in extract 25 (Danish), namely that IN is a member of a group of non-Danish speakers, or speakers of Danish as a second language. The function of these two utterances is furthermore similar in their normative suggestion that the candidate should speak and learn Danish.

In contrast to extract 25 (Danish), the direct form of address projects and demands a response from the candidate or, as in this case, the job-consultant, who comes to the defence of the candidate by stating in line 43 that ‘he has lived here for many years’. This utterance counters the suggestion of EM that they both have to learn Danish by offering a countering implication, namely that since the husband has been here for many years, he is no longer learning but in fact speaking Danish as a second language. This, however, only challenges the ascription of the husband and not the ascription of the candidate, who is also implied and included in EM’s utterance ‘so you both have to learn Danish,’ and the candidate remains categorized as not only a second language speaker but a second language learner, i.e. as a not yet proficient Danish speaker.

The defence offered by the job-consultant results in an extended topicalisation of second-language speakers and language learning practices, which has to be closed before the interaction can go on. In extract 25 (Danish), the indirectness of the way the category of second language speaker was made relevant allowed for the interaction to go on without the candidate having to respond. The advantage of this is of course that it does not, as we can see when comparing the two examples, disrupt the interaction in the same way. On the other hand, the problem is that when the category of second language speaker is made indirectly relevant, it is difficult for the candidate to respond to, or confront this categorization and the assumptions and ascriptions it entails. Although one might say that IN does in fact respond in line 34, I would argue that this response is rather a follow up response to the initial question of whether her husband is from Iran, since it is uttered in overlap with the part of EM's utterance in line 31 that adds the language dimension. Therefore it cannot as such be a reply to the language issue. When perceived as such, the language issue is not responded to by IN, but only by CO in line 43.

Although the defence of the job-consultant is successful in the sense that her redefinition of the husband as a second language speaker rather than a second language learner is accepted by EM in line 49 the topic is not closed down by either of the participants. In line 61 HO renews the orientation towards the language practice of IN by asking the strongly suggestive question 'So you must be speaking Danish at home, which is formatted as an implication from the category 'second language speaker' co-constructed by CO and EM immediately prior. HO's question is addressing IN directly and its formatting is strongly projecting a positive answer. By uttering the following 'no' in line 66 in low voice IN is orienting to her response as dispreferred but nevertheless she does not use the 0.4 seconds pause following her response as an opportunity to account for her negative reply. She is hereby not mitigating the challenge that her 'no' entails and HO responds by upgrading her initial suggestive question to the explicitly formulated demand 'You have to'.

Kjærbeck (2003), in a study of social service interactions, describes similar evaluative statements made by a social worker to a client, and she argues that they are illustrative of the achievement of a certain distribution of rights and power. This argument seems to be confirmed in this example, where the strong normative and directive statement of HO show an orientation towards a privileged right to prescribe a certain behaviour of the candidate. The power and position claimed by the employer in this example is, however, not confirmed and

accepted by the other participants. Remarkably, the very strong normative proclamation does not make IN 'give in' and admit the wrongness of her behaviour. Nor does it push her to provide the account that was not given in line 69. Instead she merely provides a follow-up elaboration of her 'no' in line 66, namely that she speaks Persian at home, which is however, by means of laughter, showing awareness of the challenge this reply entails.

Again, we see in line 81 how the job-consultant orients to the delicacy of the situation and the problems of the internship candidate with defending her practices as a 'second-language speaker' by giving a defence on her behalf. CO is generalizing the issue of language practice by using the indefinite pronoun 'one,' which removes some of the specific attention to IN and turns the practice of 'speaking the language one is most comfortable with' into something general and normal. HO only partially accepts this defence and in line 90 incorporates the generalizing format and the partial agreement in yet another argument for speaking Danish at home, namely that 'one should do it to practice. In line 95 IN attempts to justify her own language practice and language difficulty by the fact that her daughter speaks Danish well and in this way she supports the shift in attention away from her self that was initiated by the job-consultant. This is finally accepted by EM and HO, and the orientation towards IN's membership as a second-language speaker and the negotiation of what practice can or should be associated with this category is abandoned.

In both of the cases shown, when the category of second language speaker was made relevant as a topic in its own right via an implicational and normatively prescribing utterance, rather than in relation to an interactionally embedded checking of the candidate's understanding, it occurred towards the end of the interview. In this extract, it occurs in relation to a discussion of how the schedule of the internship can be arranged according to the obligations the candidate has regarding the dropping off and picking up of her children in the morning and afternoon. The candidate has mentioned that her husband can help her with this and this creates the context for EM's first utterance which seems to shift the interaction into a more casual, small-talk frame. In extract 25 (Danish) the category of second-language speaker is directly topicalised in relation to a discussion of the candidate coming to visit and work at the orchard store, where the produce is sold. This task is constructed as secondary and supplementary to the primary task of tending to and learning about the crops and it is discussed at the end of the tour of the orchard.

In both these cases then, the orientation towards the category of second language speaker as an individual topic is introduced in relation to a secondary activity in the interaction, and at a time where the interview is coming to a close and the central aspects of the planning have already been dealt with.

5.4.1 Interpretative Repertoires Associating ‘Language’ with ‘Nationality’

In the first section of the analysis that investigated how nationality was made relevant in the internship interviews, section 5.3, it was argued and illustrated that interpretative repertoires were being applied that linked notions of ‘nationality’ with the idea of ‘culture’ or a ‘system of actions, beliefs and values’. In the present analysis of how language was made relevant the interpretative repertoires at play cannot be as clearly identified and defined but the actions, interpretations and assumptions of the participants are nevertheless quite clearly informed by a range of assumptions and understandings which can, to some extent, be said to form a pattern.

The influence of interpretative repertoires on the way the category of second language speaker is made relevant is most clear when looking at the two examples where language and linguistic membership are indirectly or directly topicalised as issues in their own right. In these examples, it is clear how the local production of meaning and relevance of the category second language speaker is deeply enmeshed in broader structures of meaning and ideologies about ethnicity, integration and immigration. In the first two examples, the orientation towards the category of ‘second-language speaker’ is made in relation to the action of checking the understanding of the internship candidate and as this action is accomplished, the category of second-language speaker is backgrounded on behalf of other categories and topics. This does not mean that they are not informed by interpretative repertoires, they are merely not as illustrative examples as the last two examples in which the orientation towards language is explicit, pronounced and long-lasting and the interpretative repertoires are clearly manifested.

What revealed itself was first of all different interpretative repertoires regarding linguistic communities and membership criteria in relation to these. The various orientations of the participants towards categories related to language such as ‘Danish’, ‘second-language speaker’ and ‘Persian’ were in this way reflecting different and opposing assumptions about which language practices characterize and determine affiliation with and membership of a specific linguistic community.

This is most clearly manifested in the example with the woman from Iran, in which the employer states ‘so you both have to learn Danish’ in response to receiving information that

the internship candidate's husband is also Iranian. This statement expresses the assumption that belonging to the category 'Iranian' implies non-membership of the category 'Danish-speaking' and membership of the category 'second-language speaker' or 'second-language learner'. The category 'Iranian' is, in other words, linked to the category 'second-language speaker' or 'second-language learner' and this link is formulated as a factual statement which naturalizes the claim made and constructs it as commonsensical. The response from the job-consultant to this statement contests this assumption and expresses a contrary commonsensical position, expressed as 'no, he has lived here for many years'. The implicit assumption in this statement is that living for many years in Denmark implies a certain level of competence in the Danish language that naturally dissociates a person from the category of 'second language learner' and associates a person with the category of 'second language speaker' or merely 'Danish speaker'.

What reveals itself here is the manifestation of two different and contrary interpretative repertoires that express a conceptual link between either 'Nationality' and 'Language' or 'Residency' and 'Language'. What is very clear from this example is the way the participants orient to and negotiate these opposing logics of reasoning, and as such it represents a good example of how the actions and behaviour of the participants are interrelated with broader structures of meaning:

Extract 28: So You Both Have to Learn Danish? (Repeated extract)

13 EM: Er din mand også fra I:ran, (very thouroughly prc
14 Is your husband also from I:ran
15
16 IN: ja
17 yes
18
19 EM: ja
20 yes
21
22 IN: ja=
23 yes=
24
25 EM: =[.tsk]
26 =[.tsk]
27
28 () [.hja]
29 [.hjyeah]
30
31 EM: Så skal I begge [to]ære fdanskf? =
32 So you both have [to learn fDanishf?=
33
34 IN: [han kommer (ja/her)=
35 [he comes (yes/here)=
36
37 EM: =[sk.ha] [()]=
38 =[sk.ha] [()]=
39
40 IN: =[ja] ha ha [ha]=
41 =[yes]ha ha [ha]=
42
43 CO: =[Nej han har]boet her i mange år.
44 =[no he has] lived here for many years
45
46 IN: =[ja::]
47 =[ye::s

48
49 EM: Nå han har [boet her i mange år okay]
50 Oh he has [lived here for many years okay]
51
52 (CO/IN:) [ja () også] boet [her]
53 [yes() also] lived [here]
54
55 EM: [ja] ja
56 [yes] yes
57 (0.3)
58 IN: .shll (makes a sort of slurping sound)
59 .shll
60
61 HO: Så må i tale dansk hjemme,
62 So you must be speaking Danish at home,
63
64 (0.3)
65
66 IN: °Nej°
67 °No°
68
69 (0.4)
70
71 HO: Det skal i gøre (high pitch)
72 You have to
73
74 (0.2)
75
76 IN: Persisk h. hi hi [hi (jheg skhal] thale mhed pher[shisk]
77 Persian h. he he [he (i musth)] spheak whit Pher[shian]
78

In line 43 we see how CO on an interactional level replies negatively to the question asked by EM in line 31, despite the fact that this question projects a positive answer and how, from a discursive psychological perspective, CO's response presents not only an interactional challenge, but a challenge to a specific structure of meaning. In line 49 the understanding presented by CO is confirmed by EM and hereby constitutes a new conceptual point of departure, which is used by HO in line 61 as a premise for making another presumptuous commonsensical claim, namely 'so you must be speaking Danish at home'.

On an interactional level this question is formatted as a conditional follow-up question which is strongly projecting a confirmation from the internship candidate. From a discursive perspective, HO is negotiating the category of 'second language speaker' and more broadly the interpretative repertoire linking residency and language by forwarding the claim that membership of the category 'second-language speakers' requires that a person speaks Danish at home. In other words, HO links the category of 'second-language speaker' to the practice of 'speaking Danish at home' and is hereby revealing a third interpretative repertoire namely Private Language Use – Language, which is based on the logic that a person's membership in categories related to language is determined by whether they use that language as part of their daily lives.

The interpretative repertoires expressed in this example do not reveal themselves in the same way or as explicitly in the other examples of participants orienting towards language, and it would therefore be presumptuous and speculative to suggest that they were in effect in more than this single interview. As described in sections 3.1.1 and 5.1 I follow the methodological

guidelines and restrictions set forth by Margaret Wetherell about the identification of interpretative repertoires, and the argument just presented is for this reason only to be considered suggestive, since it hinges on observations found in only one of the four examples mentioned. Although the interpretative repertoires identified do show their distinctiveness and incommensurability through the actions and orientations of the different participants, their manifestation and influence cannot be as clearly documented in the other interviews.

While the interpretative repertoires described above are not formulated as explicitly in the other internship interviews, it may be argued that the employers' orientations towards the category second-language speaker, in the internship interviews as a whole, reveal that inferences are being made about the category membership of the internship candidates. Such inferences can be said to be informed by a conceptual link between their nationality or 'foreignness' and the category 'second-language speaker'. This link is enabled by the context of the speech situation, which is established in ways that potentially emphasize and forefront the fact that the internship candidates' are immigrants or refugees and second-language speakers of Danish. Furthermore, it can, in the case with the Somali internship candidate, be said to be enabled by his language behaviour, which, as I have argued, could be considered non-standard. Finally, one might argue that the internship candidates, and the other participants, carry with them certain transportable identities reflected in body traits, voice characteristics and religious symbols that make the category 'foreigner' potentially relevant for the participants and, following the described logic of 'nationality'-'language', enable the orientation towards language.

Some may find that the disassociation of the candidate with the category 'Danish' is in no way strange and that it is equally 'natural' that their association with categories related to nationalities other than 'Danish's is used as a basis for associating them with the category of second-language speakers. However, such membership categorizations are, as illustrated by the example and argued by discursive psychologists (Billig 1987; Wetherell & Potter 1988; Billig 1991; Wetherell & Potter 1992; Wetherell 1998; Billig 1999b; Wetherell 2005), intimately linked with ideology, and it is exactly the taken-for-granted nature of these categorizations that reveal their ideological nature. As described previously in sections 3.3.2 and 4.5.7, ideology is found in the taken for granted assumptions of a given time and place, and ideological challenge and critique involves the denaturalisation and deconstruction of such assumptions.

It is in no way a given that being born in Iran or any other place implies non-membership of the category 'Danish' or membership of the category second-language speaker. It is quite possible for a person to be born in Iran, speak Danish as a first language and be 'Danish'. The actions, interpretations and behaviour of the participants in this way reveal the workings of interpretative repertoires related to ideologies of immigration, nationality, language learning and culture.

The second observation I would like to make in relation to interpretative repertoires related to language is based on a more broadly manifested pattern identified in the assumptions and claims made about the practices of members belonging to the category 'second language learners'. What is revealed in the claims about the practices of 'second language learners' is the interpretative repertoire of 'isolated foreigners,' which is closely linked to another repertoire related to language and immigration namely 'learning through speaking'.

In the example with the Somali man at the orchard (Extract 25: Danish), these interrelated repertoires are reflected in the normative prescription of the employer that the internship candidate is to speak Danish, interact with Danish customers and learn about 'our ways'. In this example the utterance 'if you come with me in the store here you have contact with clients some who speak Danish' is based on the assumption that the internship candidate as a member of the category 'second language speaker' is isolated from Danes or people who speak Danish. The establishment of the category second-language speaker can thus be said to be not only characterized by an exclusion from the category of 'Danish,' but to be informed by an interpretative repertoire about 'foreigners' in Denmark as isolated from 'Danes' and not speaking 'Danish'. This interpretative repertoire can be said to influence the interpretations of the candidate's contributions as non-standard, but can also be said to be triggered or activated by these actions.

In the example with the woman from Iran (Extract 28: So You Both Have to Learn Danish?) the interpretative repertoire of 'learning through speaking' is reflected in the job-consultant's formerly mentioned ascription of the Iranian husband to the category 'second-language speaker' on the basis of his long period of residence in Denmark. As described, the job-consultant is refuting the job-consultants assumption that the husband has to learn Danish on the basis that he has lived in Denmark for many years. Living in Denmark and speaking Danish is, in other words, assumed to entail learning. In the same example, the interpretative

repertoire ‘speaking is learning’ is even more clearly manifested in the contribution of the employer, who later in the exchange makes an account for the formulation in line 61 ‘so you speak Danish at home’ and in line 71 ‘you have to’ which emphasizes speaking as a means of practicing and improving.

Extract 28: So You Both Have to Learn Danish? (Repeated extract)

71 HO: Det skal i gøre (high pitch)
 72 You have to
 73
 74 (0.2)
 75
 76 IN: Persisk h. hi hi [hi (jheg skhal)] thale mhed pher[shisk)
 77 Persian h. he he [he (i musth)] spheak whith Pher[shian)
 78
 79 HO: [ja:e]
 80 [ye:a
 81 CO: [Man taler nok
 82 [One probably
 83
 84 [det sprog] man [har lettest ved]
 85 speaks [the language] one [is most comfortable with]
 86
 87 IN: [JAAE hah.] [DET SVÆRT for mig]
 88 [JEAA hah.] [IT IS HARD FOR ME]
 89
 90 HO: Det gør man nok men man skal nok indimellem gøre det for at træne
 91 ik?
 92 One probably does but one should probably do it once in a while to
 93 practice right?
 94
 95 IN: Men øh min datter taler øh fi:nt dansk og også taler fi:nt persisk.
 96 But eh my daughter speaks eh go:od Danish and also speaks good
 97 Persian.
 98
 99 EM: ja det j[o g]odt
 100 well that [is go]od
 101
 102 HO: [ja]
 103 [ves]

This account, which is found in line 90, rejects a defence presented by the job-consultant on the internship candidate’s behalf after she has admitted in line 76 that she speaks Persian rather than Danish at home. As we see here ‘speaking is learning’ constitutes one of the interpretative repertoires used to negotiate and categorize the actions, behaviour and category membership of the internship candidate, which is linked to ideologies about second-language speakers formulated in this example and the previous one with the internship candidate from Somalia. These ideologies take for granted that second-language speakers should associate and speak with Danes and furthermore should speak and practice Danish at home.

This example illustrates clearly what the other examples suggest, namely that the particular speech situation of these internship interviews seem to allow for an extended degree of topicalisation of and orientation towards issues and categories that would otherwise be considered inappropriate, private or irrelevant to the overall purpose and goal of the speech situation, namely the establishment of terms and possibilities for a future internship. The limits

for what can and should be discussed during these interactions, regarding the candidate and in general, seem in other words to be stretched within the context of this speech situation, compared to for example a job-interview situation and, as the final example shows, compared to what could be expected during ordinary everyday interactions.

The final extract is furthermore a good example of how the local context of the speech situation interplays with the broader context of multiculturalist debate in the sense that the job-consultant, who acts in the role of mediator or advocate for the candidate in giving a defence for or countering the ideologically charged criticism and designation of the candidate's language behaviour made by EM and HO. This is reflected in, first of all, the way the question 'so you both have to learn Danish' in line 31 is formatted as a natural and logical consequence of the fact that IN and her husband are from Iran. This can be heard as an expression of a particular position within the Danish debate on integration, namely that foreigners coming to Denmark must learn Danish, which is a position that is not only common sense (in an ideological sense of the word) but is a legislatively established fact. Secondly, it is reflected in the response made by CO to this assumption, namely 'no he has lived here for many years', which expresses another and contrary commonsensical position, namely that if a person has lived in Denmark for many years their Danish skills are at a level that makes further formal teaching superfluous. The two positions expressed by EM and CO can in this way be read and understood from an interactional perspective as actions that project and respond to other actions but it can also be interpreted as utterances that represent positions in a culturally specific landscape of ideology and opinions.

The perspective of interpretative repertoires illuminates some of the patterns in assumptions and understandings related to immigrants, language, nationality and integration that are evoked and in effect during the internship interviews and tie in with the interactional actions and negotiations more specifically related to various goals of the speech situation. The planning and organization of the internship interview is, as illustrated, closely interwoven with a range of ideas and assumptions about the internship candidates membership to the categories 'second-language speaker', 'second-language learner', 'Iranian' and not least their non-membership to the category 'Danish'. A more discursively oriented analysis in this way illuminates that what is, in some internship interviews, required of the candidate is not only a professional but also a linguistic and cultural development and integration.

5.4.2 Summary

The analysis of how language is made relevant shows the varying ways in which language and membership categories related to language are made relevant and constructed and the different local contexts in which this occurs. I have identified two different types of orientations towards language, one which is related to the action of assuring the understanding of the internship candidate and one which is related to a more explicit topicalisation of language communities, language practices and the negotiation of the internship candidates' affiliation with these.

In the case of the first type of orientation, language is made relevant as the representatives of the work-place or the job-consultant seek to establish or check whether the candidate understands and follows either the linguistic or topical development within the interaction. In the two examples presented the establishment of either linguistic or topical understanding seems to project and get different responses from the candidate, the former causing more interactional disruption and a more extended discussion of language than the latter.

The analysis suggested that this form of checking or inquiry about the level of understanding of the candidate occurs at points in the interaction where the contributions of the candidate can be said to have been weak, minimal or non-standard in the immediately previous turns. In the first example, the question 'do you understand' occurred in the very beginning of the interview and could therefore be seen as an introductory establishment of grounds for the rest of the interview and in this case the question was specifically focusing on the linguistic understanding and level of proficiency of the candidate. In the second example, the question occurred much later in the interview and was more focusing on the general following of the candidate after a long extended turn by the employee, in which the candidate had only responded minimally.

In both cases, the candidate seemed to respond to the question as not merely a checking but an implicit request for elaboration and increasing participation, in the first example by adding emphasis and countering the implicated lack of understanding and in the second example by elaborating the confirmative response with an extended response to the issue that was being addressed by the employee. In other words the question about understanding, regardless of what can be said to trigger it, has the function of inviting increasing participation of the candidate and this invitation is acknowledged and responded to positively by both candidates.

The second type of orientation towards language was not as embedded or incorporated in other actions and activities occurring within the internship interviews. Rather they constituted topicalisations and negotiations of language proficiency, language practice and language affiliation as an activity in itself. In this way these orientations towards language were related to an assessment or negotiation of the internship candidate's membership of categories related to language rather than specific aspects of their participation and they were tied in with negotiations of language as a specific dimension of the internship and the speech situation. The two examples shown, in other words illuminated another dimension of the establishment of the category 'second-language speaker' which was not related to concrete issues of understanding. Whereas the former mentioned type of orientation towards language the understanding of the candidate occurred in the beginning of the interaction, these orientations towards the membership category second-language speaker occurred towards the end of the internship interview.

In the first example the category 'second-language speaker' was introduced indirectly by introducing the category 'some who speak Danish'. In the second example the category 'second-language speaker' was addressed more directly by the employer linking the nationality of the candidate and her husband with a specific language affiliation and practice. In both cases, language and membership categories related to language were established through a dissociation of the candidate from the category 'Danish' or 'Danish-speaker' and they were in this way, I would argue, informed by an implicit assessment of the internship candidates' language performance. In this form of orientation towards language, the actual performance of the candidates is, however, not addressed explicitly and this can be considered a paradox in light of the degree of explicitness and forwardness exhibited by the employers and employees, especially in the second example. The cases examined and illustrated nevertheless show a pattern in the way that explicit orientations towards language performance and ability do not involve an explicit topicalisation of the candidates' language related category memberships and the topicalisation of language-related membership categories does not involve specific inquiries about language performance and ability. In all cases, however, is the internship candidate's membership of the category second-language speaker either implicitly or explicitly assumed.

What characterizes the cases where language is topicalised rather than being merely oriented to in relation to clarifying understanding is that the orientation towards language in

these cases entails a normative suggestion or prescription of language behaviour. In the first of these cases, the indirectness of the orientation towards the category 'second-language speaker' allows the interaction to go on undisrupted but this at the same time it makes it difficult for the internship candidate to respond to and contest the ascription and suggested behaviour. In the second case the internship candidate is invited to negotiate and respond to the categorization and the normative suggestions made but, as illustrated, this is a difficult and delicate task, which ends up involving the job-consultant and, ultimately, produces an extensive orientation towards and discussion of language.

As a whole the various examples of orientations towards language and membership categories related to language illustrate how the orientation towards the specificity of the speech situation interrelates with orientations towards a broader cultural and linguistic context of meaning that makes certain actions and interpretations possible and available. As argued and illustrated, the actions and orientations of the participants draw on interpretative repertoires related to language, which is manifested in certain patterns of assumptions and meaning.

One of the examples manifested an interpretative repertoire that naturalized a relation between a specific nationality and a specific language community membership. This was distinguishable from two other repertoires, one that conceptualized language community membership as defined by residence or more specifically 'time of residence' and another that linked language community membership with 'private language practice'. These repertoires were shown to be intimately tied in with the participants' negotiations of the category second-language speaker.

The internship interviews were more generally informed by an interpretative repertoire related to language learning that linked language learning with verbal interaction. This repertoire was interrelated with the former mentioned repertoires but was specifically activated in relation to negotiations of the practices and behaviour of second-language speakers. As such it was manifested in the normative suggestions made that 'second-language speakers' should interact and speak with Danes and should furthermore speak and practice Danish in the private realm of the home. It was argued that the interpretative repertoire 'speaking is learning' was linked to a pattern of understanding about immigrants as isolated from Danes, which was manifested in the interview with the internship candidate from Somalia.

As illustrated, the various assumptions expressed tie in with broader ideologies of language, nationality and immigration and, as shown, also inform and influence the very 'local' negotiation and assessment of the internship candidate. In this way the negotiation of meaning of the category 'second-language speaker' taking place in the second interview is illustrative of the way ideological battles, conditioned by the controversial nature of common-sense (Billig 1987; Billig 1991), tie in with the concrete negotiation of meaning around the categories second-language learner, second-language speaker, Danish-speaker, Iranian which again ties in with the actions of asking questions, making normative claims, suggesting behaviour, and giving defences and accounts. Or in other words, the interactional utterances and actions, including membership categorizations that are involved in interactional processes of social organization and sense-making have not only *procedural* consequentiality but tie in with and potentially influence broader structures of meaning, common sense and ideology.

5.5 How are Categories Related to Religion made Relevant?

In some of the interviews the participants oriented to categories related to religion and associated the internship candidate with these categories. It is not, however, religion as such which is made relevant in these interviews, but rather more specifically Islam and specific practices associated with Muslims that are, in various ways problematised in relation to the tasks involved in different internships. This involved a conceptualization of religion as a community of people sharing and valuing certain practices and beliefs which was similar to the previously mentioned conceptualizations of culture as a ‘way of doing things’ and a ‘system of belief’. The process of associating the internship candidate with categories related to religion was in this way linked to the dissociation from ‘Danish culture’ and ‘Danish ways’.

Most often it is the employment representatives, that is, the employer or the employee, addressing and evoking the category Muslim, but this is not always the case. In the following, I will show and compare two examples of cases in which it is the employer and the employee respectively that explicitly introduce the category Muslim and the subject of religion, and one example in which it is implicitly made relevant by the candidate. I will show how the orientations towards the category Muslim creates an axis of differentiation, not between Islam as a religion and other religions, such as Christianity, but rather between Islam as a culture and Danish culture. Islam is, in other words, constructed as a system of practices determining the behaviour of Muslims and this system of practices is considered conflictual and problematic in relation to common sense and common practice in Denmark. The orientation towards religion in this way entails or involves an orientation toward cultures.

The first example is from an interview with a candidate from Somalia, who is being interviewed for an internship at a residential home. The exchange occurs approximately 12 minutes into the interaction, and prior to the extract the participants have been talking about the candidate’s motivations for doing the internship, and the employer has presented the residential home and described the tasks that the candidate will be involved in. Immediately prior to the extract, the job-consultant has provided a long description of some of the things that would be valuable for the candidate to learn about and take part in while doing the internship, and the employer has interrupted this description with a request for the candidate to present herself. The extract begins with the end of this presentation by the candidate. The

candidate has been formatting this presentation as a list³⁵, providing information such as her Somali origin, her age, her parental status and her occupational goals. The first line of the extract continues this listing, which is now focused on personality traits.

Extract 24: The Scarf (repeated extract)

234 IN: Jeg er meget tålmodig o:g jeg [er] tenlig
 235 I am very patient a:nd I [am] friendly
 236 HO: [ja]
 237 [yes]
 238 (0.2)
 239 HO: .hja [.hhh
 240 .hyeah[.hhh
 241 IN: [og jeg er god til at [samarbejde med]
 242 [and I am good at at [cooperating with]
 243 HO: [Nadia nu jeg nødt til at spørge dig]=
 244 [Nadia now I have to ask you]=
 245
 246 =fordi jeg kan jo se du har beklædning på og når det [er]
 247 =because I can see that you are wearing a clothing and [when]
 248 IN: [ja]
 249 [yes]
 250 HO: man går rundt og har meget med hygiejne at gøre
 251 one is walking around dealing a lot with hygiene
 252
 253 IN: ja
 254 yes
 255 (0.2)
 256 HO: .h øøhm (0.5) hvordan havde du tænkt dig at øøh være klædt der
 257 .h eehm (0.5) how were you planning on eeh being dressed then
 258
 259 altså vi har jo hvide kitler vi har på .hh
 260 I mean we have white uniforms that we wear .hh
 261
 262 HO: [og] du skal nok have noget mindre ned over dig
 263 [and] you will probably need something smaller over you
 264 IN: [ja]
 265 [yes]
 266
 267 IN: ja jeg har l- en lille tørklæde.
 268 yes I have s- a small scarf.
 269
 270 HO: Det har du.=
 271 You do.=

³⁵ Roberts (Roberts & Campbell 2006) describes how the choice of such a listing format is a more prevalent feature of presentations made by born abroad candidates, and how this format can contribute to giving off the impression that the candidates' answers have been taught or tutored and hereby make the born abroad candidates seem less independent and competent.

272
273 IN: =ja=
274 =yes=
275
276 CO: [så det] [er godt (forberedt)]
277 [so that] [is well (prepared)]
278 (HO:) [()]
279 [()]
280 IN: [jeg skal af den store]=
281 [I will get rid of the big]=
282 HO: =ja
283 =yes
284
285 IN: [ja]
286 [yes]
287 HO: [nå] men det er fint nej [men] jeg ville spørge dig fo[r]di jeg
288 [well] that is fine no [but] I wanted to ask you be[cause I
289 IN: [hh] [jhhh=
290 [hh] [yeahh=
291
292 HO: ved jo] at øh [i har jeres: øh:] forskellige måder hvordan det
293 do know] that eh [you have you:r eh.] various ways in which it
294 IN: =hh [det godt spørgsmål ja]
295 =hh [it's a good question yes]
296
297 HO: er [at det er vigtigt] for jer at [på]klædnin[gen]
298 is [that it is important] to you that [the] clo[thing]
299 IN: [ja hhh.] [ja] [ja]
300 [yes hhh.] [yes] [yes]
301
302 HO: skal være [ik?]
303 should be [right?]
304 IN: [det rig]tigt
305 [that's ri]ght
306
307 IN: [ja jeg har et lille tørklæde]
308 [yes I have a small scarf]
309 HO: [hh jeg ved også at jeg bliver nødt] til at sige dig omkring netop
310 [hh I also know that I will have] to say to you about
311
312 hygiejnen altså [der] kan vi simpelthen ikke have noget
313 hygiene I mean [there] we can simply not have anything
314

There are three things especially worth noting in this extract: First of all, by interrupting in line 243, HO diverts the topic of the presentation from the personality traits that IN has offered in line 234 and 241 and focuses on the topic of IN's clothing. HO does not format her inquiry about IN's clothing as a direct question, but as a question embedded in a declarative statement of a need, namely 'now I have to ask you', which is a preface that works to preempt an account for the posing of the question and to mitigate HO's responsibility for the actual question, which follows in line 256, namely 'how were you planning on being dressed then'. As previously described in chapter 2 section 2.2.1 pre-faces can have a range of functions such as the projection of an extended turn of talk (Schegloff 1980; Schegloff 1982; Kjærbeck 1998b), the initiation of a topic shift (Kjærbeck 1998b) and the mitigation of a dispreferred or a disaffiliative action (Heritage 1984b). These functions can all be said to be in effect in the present example where the introduction of the issue of the scarf by HO not only represents a topic-shift and a mitigation of a disaffiliative action, but also the beginning of an extended unit of talk which is allowed to continue until HO marks the completion of the issue of the scarf much later in the interaction, which will be shown in the following part of the analysis.

Returning to the question of disaffiliation and social solidarity, another thing which should be mentioned as a possible mitigation of the disaffiliative action of HO is the fact that

she avoids the explicit mentioning of religion, not only by avoiding the use of the religious term for the scarf that IN is wearing, namely hijab, but by refraining from using the word ‘scarf’ altogether, which is the one normally used in public debates about the style of dress of Muslim women. Instead she uses the word ‘beklædning’ (‘garment’), which can be said to be a more neutral, though slightly awkward, term that could just as easily refer to IN’s pants or overcoat rather than merely her head-dress. She in this way avoids turning the issue into a religious one.

Through the account for asking the question that HO provides in line 250, prior to the actual question, HO further avoids the topic of religion by presenting the issue of IN’s clothing as one related to a matter of hygiene, and hereby she frames the question as being strictly work-related. Thus, HO goes to a lot of trouble to make the question appear neutral, practical and work-related, but at the same time she is orienting to the sensitivity of it by formatting the question in a very indirect way by emphasizing her obligation to pose it in the first place, and by avoiding the use of a terms such as hijab or scarf that both carry a heavy connotational load.

The second thing to note is that IN immediately answers the question in line 267 and hereby acknowledges the problem as being the scarf or the size of the scarf, and solves it. A lot of quite intricate interpretative processes can be said to be involved in this response, which demonstrates not only the substantial communicative competence of IN, but also her ability to decode the above mentioned mitigated and indirect question presented by HO as well as the implicit common sense³⁶ criticism of the scarf that this question entails. Not only does IN in this way manage to infer that HO by the term ‘beklædning’ is referring to the scarf, but she is also inferring from the proposition made by HO in line 262 ‘og du skal nok have noget mindre ned over dig’ (‘and you will probably need to have something smaller over you’) that the problem is the size of the scarf. Hence, IN tunes into what is explicitly and implicitly communicated within the context of the speech situation and, more specifically, the context of the utterance by HO. Furthermore she is orienting to a broader ideological context within Denmark informed by and informing public debate about Muslim women wearing scarves.

Finally, it is noteworthy that even though the problem is potentially solved in line 270 where HO gives a satisfied third turn response, the relevance of the scarf is continually renewed by HO in line 287 and 309, where she provides accounts for why the scarf is a problem and why she has brought it up. The first account that HO provides for having asked

³⁶ Common sense is here used in the way proposed by Michael Billig and explained in sections 3.3.2 and 4.5.7.

the question is particularly interesting, since it, contrary to the account provided in advance in line 250 and the account provided in line 309, does not focus on the issue of hygiene but on the commonsensical knowledge of Muslim practices of dressing. The practical issue of what clothes are convenient in relation to the work that the candidate is going to take part in, is in this account hereby backgrounded and the posing of the question is accounted for by reference to HO's knowledge of the importance of the scarf for Muslim women. Hereby the question is legitimized or explained as a courtesy to IN and an attempt to establish and meet her needs. Again the words Muslim, Islam, hijab or even scarf are not explicitly used, but through the continuing use of the personal plural pronoun 'I' ('You') and the previous context of IN's mentioning of the scarf, the category of Muslim women is constructed and attributed with specific category-bound activities, namely dressing in a specific way and having specific feelings invested in doing so, and IN is associated with this category by being addressed as a member of the category.

The categorization of IN is, in other words, done by combining the semiotic resources and social resources of the immediate speech situation, such as the head dress that IN is wearing, and the distribution of roles and rights of the participants, with the available *common sense* understandings of Muslim practices and mental dispositions. HO is thus draws on an interpretative repertoire about Muslim women, which is used as an interactional resource in the establishment and negotiation of the future internship. IN confirms HO's categorization of her and the construction of the category 'You' by saying 'it's a good question yes' in line 295, by giving acknowledgement tokens in line 300, and finally by saying 'that's right' in line 304.

The second account that HO provides in line 309 to 313 focuses, like the first account provided in line 243-250, on the issue of hygiene and is thus seeks to legitimise the question on the basis of practical concerns related to the internship, rather than social considerations towards the practices and orientations of Muslims. As opposed to the account emphasizing the social considerateness of HO, the two accounts addressing the issue of hygiene are both formatted in a way that mitigates the responsibility of HO by framing it as an obligation that she brings up the issue. HO thus seems to be orienting towards two opposing norms or beliefs, namely on the one hand, the idea that people should adjust and accommodate their individual practices to the framework provided by institutionalized public establishments and regulations such as those constituted by and constituting the context of a residential home, and on the other hand, the idea that people have the right to have and practice different religions. The hyper-

accountability that HO is displaying in the extract may be viewed as a manifestation of and orientation towards the contrary and dilemmatic nature of common sense regarding the individual's rights and practices in relation to the demands of society.

Through the accounts that HO provides, she is orienting towards different positions in a social, cultural and ideological dilemma and ongoing argument. IN is showing understanding and alignment with the various positions that HO presents, but nevertheless continues to dismiss the issue as a problem by repeating in line 307 that she will be using a small scarf. IN in other words, manages to present a compromising solution to the dilemma that HO is indirectly describing and orienting to. Although HO accepts this solution right away, she makes the discussion of the scarf carry on for over a minute by continuing to present a total of five different accounts for addressing the scarf, three of which appear within this extract and two of which appear just after. This forces the candidate into a difficult and prolonged position of defence and rebuttal that not only diverts the focus of the interaction away from the presentation of self that was initially requested by HO, but also poses an increasing and perhaps unnecessary linguistic, social and interactional challenge for the candidate.

A different perspective on this is that HO is doing both parties a favour in addressing this delicate topic and allowing IN an opportunity to state her position in this regard. The immediate and relevant response by IN seems to support this perspective in the sense that she is able to use the opportunity given to voice her opinion in a way that accommodates the interests of HO and presents herself as willing to make compromises for the sake of fitting in. However, considering the way HO continually renews the relevance of the issue of the scarf and thereby the relevance of the category Muslim, I would argue that while the topicalisation is potentially beneficial to the future internship, the prolonging of the issue is problematic for both the internship candidate and the employer who both struggle to close the topic and move on to other issues.

The job-consultant contributes by attempting to alleviate the situation and diminish the problem of the scarf. First she supports the first response by IN in line 276 by saying 'so it is well prepared,' which actually suggests the conclusion to be drawn by HO. Later, in the following part of the exchange, she prompts IN to show HO the small scarf that she plans on using and illustrates how IN plans to wear it.

Extract 24: The Scarf (continued)

336 CO: =Nadia du har jo dit lille tørklæde med,=
337 =Nadia you did bring your small scarf,=
338
339 IN: =ja
340 =yes
341
342 CO: [s-]Nadia har sagt hun vil sætte den under uniformen så også
343 [s-]Nadia has said she will put it under her uniform so also
344 HO: [ja]
345 [yes]
346
347 CO: [(flytte) den ind her]
348 [(move) it in here]
349 HO: [jamen lige [præcis]]
350 [yes well [exactly]]
351 IN: [ja]
352 [yes]
353 CO: [og så]
354 [and then]
355 HO: [ja]
356 [yes]
357
358 CO: j[a og så den vej ind]
359 y[es and then that way in]
360 IN: [jeg er klar over det heh.]
361 [I am aware of it heh.]
362
363 CO: [bagved]
364 [behind]
365 HO: [ja]
366 [yes]

Thus, the job-consultant takes part in the interactional work of IN to solve the issue, but her demonstration of how the scarf will be worn does not contribute to the closing or abandoning of the topic, but rather prolongs the issue further, supported by the actions of HO, who provides three more accounts following this sequence.

The two extracts shown so far from this exchange, illustrates the influence of the participation framework and the distribution of rights to talk and control the interaction. Although HO, at various moments throughout this exchange, gives satisfied third turn responses to the rebuttals and solutions offered by IN and CO, HO is the only one being granted and claiming the right to move on to a new topic. Hence, IN and CO continually acknowledge, respond to and meet the problems and accounts raised by HO, but leave it up to HO to decide when the problem is properly solved and when she is ready to move on to something else. In the following and final part of the exchange, we also see this interrelation of the distribution of roles and rights and the dynamics of the specific ongoing activity of negotiating the problem of the scarf.

Extract 24: The Scarf (continued)

389 HO: [et ældre menneske]så skal du šku ku mærke og de [skal] ku mærke dig
 390 [an older person] then you must feel them and they [must] feel you
 391 () [()]
 392 IN: [ja]
 393 [yes]
 394 HO: [også ik]
 395 [also right]
 396 IN: [ja det rig]tigt ja
 397 [yes that's] right yes
 398
 399 IN: Jeg klar om det.
 400 I am aware of that.
 401
 402 HO: [ˈjaː]
 403 [ˈyesː]
 404 CO: [og] især også sådan altså at man er på arbejde når man har [sådan
 405 [and] especially also that one is at work when one is wearing [kind
 406 HO: [ja]
 407 [yes]
 408 lidt sådan lidt and-[andre tøj på]=
 409 of a bit sort of dif[ferent clothes]=
 410 IN: [ja det rigtigt]=
 411 [yes that's right]=
 412 HO: =ja
 413 =yes
 414
 415 IN: Man kan [ik'] arbejde og så [man] har e[t stort] tør[k]æde
 416 One can [not] work and then [one] is we[ring a big] sca[rf]
 417 (HO/CO:) [(ˈjaː)] [(ˈjaː)] [(ˈne]ː.ˈhjaː)] [(ˈhjaː)]
 418 [(yes)] [(yes)] [(no .hyea)] [(ˈhyea)]
 419 (0.3)
 420 (HO/CO:)mm=
 421 mm=
 422 HO: =.h[hh vi har vi har jo udover øøh]
 423 =.h[hh we have we do have besides eeh]
 424 IN: [Man skal have en lille]
 425 [one should have a small]

Here, in line 389, we see the final account provided by HO during the negotiation of the scarf, which is focused on the need for the elders to feel the candidate and vice versa, which again is acknowledged and confirmed by IN. Once again, HO gives a satisfied third turn response in line 402, but does not follow this up with a clear topic-closer or the initiation of a new topic, so CO and IN, one after the other, each make another attempt to ease and accommodate the concerns of HO by providing two additional accounts for why a smaller scarf would be a good idea.

The first account by CO suggests that a change of clothes in general has a symbolic function of indicating a change from a private to a professional context. This is confirmed by both IN, in overlap, and HO in the next turn. The account offered next by IN has a slightly different emphasis on the impracticality of working in a big scarf and this is supported with acknowledgement tokens from HO. The greatness in number and the placement of these acknowledgement tokens suggest already at this point that HO is at this point bringing the topic to a close, which she then finally does explicitly in line 422, by introducing a new topic.

IN, however, does not pick up on the fact that HO is finally moving on to something new, but rather anticipates that HO's utterance is still on the matter of the scarf, which is clear

from the fact that she, in overlap, makes yet another conclusive response to the subject namely ‘man skal have en lille’, ‘one needs a small’. Considering that this utterance overlaps almost entirely with the topic initiation by HO, IN’s utterance seems more like a delayed elaboration than a display of misunderstanding of HO’s turn. In any case, the central point here is that the topic is finally abandoned, and that the participants orient to HO as having the right to initiate and close the topic.

This first example of religious orientation being made relevant shows how religion is not topicalised and negotiated directly but is rather oriented to indirectly through the negotiations of the extent to which a specific form of practice, in this case a specific way of dressing, constitutes a potential problem for the tasks involved in the future internship. The example furthermore shows, however, how the immediate discussion and negotiation of a specific religious practice reflects a dilemma between two contrary common sense positions, namely ‘individual rights’ and ‘community demands and regulations’.

Finally, the example shows how the acceptance and admittance of the candidate into the internship is not merely dependent on the candidate’s willingness to accommodate and change her way of dressing and her ability to communicate this willingness, but also and perhaps even more so on the employer deciding that the problem raised has in fact been solved and allowing the interaction to move on to other issues. The employer in this way has a gatekeeping function not only in having the power and right to decide whether or not the candidate will be offered the internship but also in having the power and right to decide which topics are to be addressed during the interview and when they have been sufficiently covered and debated. In this interaction the priority and attention given to the topic of the scarf can be said to exceed what was projected by the original question posed by the employer and the following answer given by the candidate. Not to say that this is in itself extraordinary but merely to suggest that the issue could potentially have been abandoned sooner, most likely to the advantage of all parties.

In the following example, we see a similar situation in which a question is asked about a potential conflict between a specific religious practice and a work-related task and although this conflict is immediately solved or dismissed by the candidate, the issue is elaborated and expanded into an extended discussion of religion that forces the candidate and the job-consultant into a position of defence and rebuttal.

The example is taken from an interview with a candidate from Afghanistan for an internship at a home help company. The extract occurs about five minutes into the interview, where the participants have talked about the experience that the candidate has with similar kinds of work and the employer and the employee have talked about some of the things that the candidate needs to know and do in the job. Immediately prior to the exchange the employee has asked whether the candidate is able to read from a shopping list and they have established that this is not a problem.

Extract 36: Liquor and Pork

144 EM: Og du har heller ikke noget imod at ehm: du
 145 har ikke noget religiøse sådn- begrænsninger i forhold til at .h
 146 købe nogen varer vel?
 147
 148 And you don't mind either ehm: you don't have any
 149 religious kind of- limitations in relation to buying some groceries
 150 right?
 151 (0.2)
 152 IN: mm nej
 153 mm no
 154
 155 EM: nej det godt
 156 no that's good
 157 (0.3)
 158 EM: Fordi vi havde nogen piger som sagt nej til at købe øhm: (0.4) .h
 159 spiritus 'for eksempel' >de ville ik de må- de- de måtte< ikke
 160 røre ved dem [(ja)]
 161
 162 Because we had some girls who said no to buying ehm: (0.4) .h
 163 liquor for example >they would not they co- they- they could< not
 164 touch them [(yes)]
 165
 166 CO: [helle]r ikke flas[ker]
 167 [not] bottles eit[ther]
 168 IN: [heh.]
 169 (0.6)
 170 HO: nej=
 171 no=
 172 EM: ='n[ej*]
 173 ='n[no*]
 174 HO: [n]ej
 175 [n]o
 176 HO: vi har ogs- haft pro[blemer med] svinekød=
 177 we have als- had pro[blems with] pork=
 178 EM: [og de:]
 179 [and they:]
 180 EM: =ja: og [svine]kød de ville heller ikke købe nogen pøl[ser]
 181 =yes: and[por]k they would not buy any sausages ei[ther]
 182 CO: [okay]
 183 [okay]
 184 HO: [nej]
 185 [no]

186 EM: eller svinekød eller sådan noget det det kan vi ikke bruge til
 187 noget
 188
 189 or pork or that kind of thing that that is of no use to us
 190 (0.5)
 191 EM: Med alt vores respekt for forskellige: øh: religi[øse:]
 192 with all our respect for different: eh: relig[ious:]
 193 HO: [religioner]
 194 [religions]
 195 EM: sådan øh: religioner o- så videre .h det kan vi ikke bruge til
 196 noget fordi [vi] kan ikke (0.4) byde vores kunder på at nå nu nu
 197
 198 like eh: religions an- so on .h that is of no use to us
 199 because [we] can not (0.4) tell our clients that oh now now
 200 IN: [.hja]
 201 [.hja]
 202 EM: kommer den hjemmehjælper så skal [du] spise oksekød det det kan vi
 203 this homehelper is coming so [you] must eat beef that that we can
 204 IN: [n-]
 205
 206 EM: desværre ikke
 207 unfortunately not do

As opposed to the previous extract the question from the employer is in this extract posed quite directly and is specifically projecting a negative response as a preferred answer, which it receives from IN in line 152. There is some indication of hesitation and word-search displayed by the dispreferred format of the ‘ehm:’ in line 144 and the ‘sådn-’ (‘kind of’) in line 145 (149 in English translation) but contrary to the previous example, religion is explicitly topicalised and attributed with specific dispositions and limitations regarding specific groceries.

The formatting in the first part of this example is however quite similar to the one in the previous example, in the sense that we have a slightly hesitant question that topicalises religion, associates the candidate with this religion, and presents a potential disagreement between the activities attributed to this religion and the activities involved in the internship. This question is then responded to by the candidate in a way which dismisses and solves the suggested conflict and this leads to a satisfied third turn response from the person having asked the question in the first place.

The final similarity is that this does not close the topic and lead the employer or the employee to move on to a different topic but rather it is followed up by the employer producing an account for the question and for the assessment in line 155, that is an elaboration of the proposed conflict. Here EM focuses the account on previous experiences with girls that would not buy liquor. There is an interesting self-repair here, where EM repairs ‘ville ikke’ (‘would not’) into ‘måtte ikke’ (‘could not’), which highlights that the girls’ saying no to buying liquor was not a matter of choice but rather of dictation or prescription. Like the example with the woman from Iran, who did not speak Danish at home, this self-repair can be understood in relation to a broader cultural context of ideologies and common sense

understandings regarding Muslim women. From this perspective, emphasizing the girls' Muslim practice as dictated rather than chosen can be seen as a reproduction of a common sense position often voiced in the debate on Muslim women and integration, namely that Muslim women are oppressed by their religious background, and often more specifically, their fanatic husbands. Furthermore, the denial of buying alcohol is changed into a lack of allowance to even touch alcohol ('røre') in line 160 (164 in English translation) which constitutes an upgrade and what Pomerantz calls an extreme case formulation (Pomerantz 1986), that serves to legitimize the claim that EM is making and in this case makes her question seem commonsensical.

In the previous example we saw how the job-consultant contributed to the immediate solving of the issue by supporting the candidate's response in saying 'so that is well prepared'. Here the job-consultant enters the exchange at a slightly different position, namely in line 166 after the account provided by the employer, and rather than contributing to a quick solving of the issue she here contributes to prolonging the orientation towards religion starting in line 158 by probing that account and hereby inviting an elaboration from the employee. The orientation towards and discussion of religion begins with a narrative about the other Muslim girls that used to work at the company and did not want to buy alcohol and it ends in line 345 where HO gives a satisfied conclusive remark 'yes well that is then sort of all right' and moves on to another topic.

Although the actions of the job-consultant here contribute to opening up the topic of religion rather than closing it down, the contribution of the job-consultant does implicitly support the defensive or dismissal thrust of the response from the candidate since her utterance 'heller ikke flasker' ('not bottles either') works to make the choice and position of the girls extraordinary. She in other words constructs this group of Muslim girls as distinct and different from the candidate and associates the former with a more extreme or radical behaviour, which makes the candidate's position seem more aligned with the common sense that EM has established by her initial question.

After a confirmation from both EM and HO in line 170, 172 and 174 to the question posed by CO, HO takes the opportunity to in line 176 further expands the legitimizing description of previous experience previously offered by EM. She does so by in more general terms describing how 'they have also had problems with pork', which attributes another form of behaviour to the previously established category of Muslim girls, namely not eating or

dealing with pork. EM overlaps this utterance with what seems to be a continuation of her previous more specific description of the situation with the girls, but she gives up and restarts this description in line 180 after HO has finished, now formatting it as a response to HO's contribution and incorporating the issue of pork into her description of how the girls would not buy sausages. EM finishes this description by making an evaluation in line 186 and 195 of this type of behaviour, namely 'det kan vi ikke bruge til noget' ('that is of no use to us'), which finally explicitly establishes the argumentative thrust of original question posed, namely that if IN were to have problems with buying either pork or liquor then she would not be useful for them as an employee. In line 191 EM makes a disclaimer for this statement and emphasizes that it is not a matter of having a lack of respect for religion as such but merely a practical question of offering the clients a certain service.

EM and HO in other words cooperate here in describing a problem with the behaviour of certain Muslim members of staff which works to legitimize and account for inquiring about the candidate's preferences and position regarding shopping for the clients. Furthermore it works to normatively prescribe a specific behaviour, which the candidate is forced to position herself in relation to. In the following extract we see how IN responds to the categorization of Muslims and Muslim behaviour that HO and EM have made and associated IN with.

Extract 36: Liquor and Pork (continued)

208 (0.2) -
 209 IN: Fordi: jeg har også arbejdet i Rigshospitalet
 210 because: I have also worked in Rigshospitalet
 211 (0.2)
 212 EM: mja
 213 mja
 214 (.)
 215 IN: I opvask og ogs- i køkkenhjælp
 216 In dishwashing and also- in kitchen help
 217
 218 EM: ja
 219 yes
 220
 221 IN: men jeg har også hakket svinekød
 222 but I have also chopped pork
 223
 224 EM: okay
 225 okay
 226

227 IN: men jeg har ikke [spist]
 228 but I have not [eaten]
 229
 230 EM: [du har] ikke noget problem
 231 [you have] no problem
 232 IN: nej
 233 no
 234
 235 EM: nej nej
 236 no no
 237
 238 IN: For jeg har også muslim! men jeg ikke spiser
 239 Because I have also Muslim! but I not eat
 240 (0.2)
 241 EM: ja=
 242 yes=
 243
 244 IN: =bare jeg skærer svinekød=
 245 =just I cut pork=
 246
 247 EM: =ja
 248 =yes
 249
 250 IN: også jeg hakker den
 251 also I chop it
 252
 253 EM: ja
 254 yes
 255 (0.5)
 256 IN: også jeg (0.4) lægger på plads
 257 also I (0.4) put it in place
 258
 259 EM: ja (.) ja selvfølgelig ja
 260 yes (.) yes of course yes
 261
 262 IN: alt muligt
 263 all kinds of things
 264 (0.2)
 265 EM: selvfølgelig ja
 266 of course yes
 267 (0.4)
 268 EM: .hja det godt
 269 .yhes that's good

By beginning her utterance with the word ‘fordi’ (‘because’) followed by a description of her previous work at Rigshospitalet, which involved chopping and cutting pork IN formats her response as an account for her previous response. She in other words describes her ways of dealing with and handling pork in the past as proof that she has none of the problems that EM and HO describe in relation to Muslims. In line 227 and 238-244 she implicitly challenges EM’s and HO’s association of a specific type of behaviour with the category Muslims by stating first that she does not eat pork and secondly that she is also a Muslim but she does not eat pork she only cuts it. Although the construction of the sentence in line 238 is a bit confusing since it seems to suggest that Muslims normally do eat pork the following line 244 clarifies that what is being said is that IN is a Muslim, and (not but) she does not eat pork, but she does cut it, which dissociates her from the category of Muslim women made potentially relevant for IN by EM and HO, who do not eat it and do not want to touch or buy it.

EM responds positively to IN’s description of her previous experience with handling pork and does not take the floor or close the topic until IN indicates that her description is over by saying ‘alt muligt’ (‘all kinds of things’) in line 262. At this point EM gives a final

indication that she has understood IN's description, namely 'selvfølgelig ja' ('yes of course'), which constructs IN's utterance as commonsensical and accepts it as a valid and satisfactory reply to the concern raised.

Following yet another pause, which again gives IN the opportunity for supplementary comments, EM indicates a closing of the topic by saying 'hja det godt' (.hyes that's good), which is a similar utterance to the one in line 155, 'nej det er godt' (no that's good), before the initiation of the account and the topic of religion. The sequential environment of the utterance is markedly different here, however, in the sense that in line 155 it constituted a third turn response in a question-answer-response sequence but here in line 268 it occurs at the end of a sequence of descriptions, presented by IN, and positive responses, given by EM, and furthermore it constitutes a follow-up to a positive response, offered by the same person in the previous turn, namely EM.

As mentioned previously, the job-consultant contributes in a different way in the beginning of the sequence than the job-consultant in the previous example and as shown this can be said to contribute to an elaboration rather than a closing of the topic. This happens again at this point in the interaction, where EM has initiated a closing of the topic. Rather than allowing for either EM or HO to change the topic, or alternatively change the topic herself, CO takes the floor and makes a comment that again opens up or prolongs the topic of pork.

Extract 36: Liquor and Pork (continued)

268 CO: men [så] længe man ikke spiser den=
 269 but [as] long as one does not eat it=
 270 EM: [så]
 271 [so]
 272 IN: =nej=
 273 =no=
 274
 275 CO: =så så bliver man ikke syg af den=
 276 =then then one does not get sick from it=
 277
 278 EM: =nej=
 279 =no=
 280
 281 CO: =fordi der er også mange danskere der ikke sp- spiser svinekød
 282 =because there are also many Danes that don't eat- eat pork
 283
 284 EM: nej rigtigt
 285 no right
 286
 287 CO: og det er netop på grund af hygiejne heh. [heh. heh.]
 288 and that is exactly because of hygiene heh. [heh. heh.]
 289 HO: [heh. heh.]
 290 [heh. heh.]

CO's comment has the function of in some ways summarizing the gist of what they have been negotiating, namely the difference between not eating pork and not handling pork, but furthermore it seems to have the function of downgrading the seriousness of the matter by

introducing yet another reason for not eating pork, namely the diseases and bad hygiene that pork is often associated with.

This is more explicitly turned into a joking format in line 281 to 287 where CO seems to be delivering the punch-line of this issue of hygiene and signal this by adding laughter. CO's comment in this way on the one hand contributes to the closing of the topic by summarizing the issue of not eating pork and turns it into a joking matter, which draws attention away from the seriousness with which the subject was previously dealt and furthermore normalizes IN's behaviour by making 'eating pork' seem commonsensical. In this way it has a supportive function in relation to the candidate. On the other hand, the comment is potentially opening up or prolonging the topic further by sequentially inviting a response from EM and HO and in this way it is counterproductive to refocusing the interaction on the competences and qualities of the candidate, which was the ongoing activity before the issue of pork and liquor was elaborated.

In this specific case the job-consultant's attempt to divert attention from the seriousness and the religious aspect of the issue of pork is partially successful in the sense that she manages to generate some laughter from HO and the exchange later moves into a more general discussion of other reasons why some people choose not to eat pork, such as animal welfare and so on. Nevertheless the action of the job-consultant is here potentially problematic for the candidate since it, as mentioned, postpones a final closing of the topic and diverts attention away from the subject of the internship and the competences of the candidate. Although humour can be said to contribute to making the interaction more relaxed and thereby perhaps easier for the internship candidate, the fact that the topic is not closed down and replaced with another but rather merely diverted by the job-consultant into a more general discussion enables the following return to the original topic of religious practices.

Extract 36: Liquor and Pork (continued)

293 .
294 .
295 .
296 EM: så så så (.) køber de ikke (.) svinekød mere
297 so so so (.) they don't buy (.) pork anymore
298
299 HO: og for eksempel vil de ikke købe for eksempel to øl eller
300 sådan noget lignende de kan ikke tage to øl ik altså
301
302 and for example they will not buy for example two beers or
303 something like that they can not ake two beers right
304
305 CO: ne:j
306 no:
307
308 HO: fordi man ikke drikker det behø- derfor kan man jo godt købe
309 to øl med to øl med til en kunde ik
310
311 because one does not drink it need- one can still buy
312 two beers for two beers for a client right
313
314 CO: [det jo] det
315 [that's] right
316
317 IN: [.hja]
318 [.hyes]
319
320 HO: ja
321 yes
322

While the general discussion about eating pork for other reasons than religion has been omitted from this extract, we see how EM's summarizing comment in line 296, which is about people who have stopped buying pork for animal welfare reasons, is used as stepping stone for HO to return to the issue of not wanting to buy alcohol. The topical development of the discussion of religious practices in relation to certain groceries is in this way not only influenced by the sequential context and the participation framework but by a lexical development in the formulation of the issue.

Starting off with a focus on not buying liquor for religious reasons, moving on to not buying pork for religious reasons, then developing into a discussion of the difference eating pork and handling pork, followed by a general talk about other reasons for not eating pork, and then for not buying pork which enables the final return by HO in line 299 to the issue of buying alcohol. HO here uses the resources of 'køber de ikke svinekød' to reactivate the category of Muslims and the category bound behaviour of not wanting to buy alcohol, although the category made relevant by EM just previous to this extract is in fact not 'Muslims' but 'animal welfare conscious consumers'.

During this long exchange circling around the issue of practices in relation to liquor and pork, religion is in this way relevant and oriented to, although not explicitly at all times, and HO's reintroduction of the issue of buying alcohol shows this. The summarizing comment previously made in line 268 by the job-consultant in this way turns out to have the counterproductive consequences that were potentially projected by opening up the topic for

further elaboration since the candidate is now again faced with a highly normatively laden statement about Muslim practices, which she has to position herself in relation to and counter. At this point in the interaction the job-consultant contributes in a way that is highly similar to the role enacted by the job-consultant in the previous example (see Extract 24: The Scarf, line 336 and 342), namely by speaking on the candidates behalf in a way which dismisses the problem and represents the candidate as accommodating and flexible in her religious practice.

Extract 36: Liquor and Pork (continued)

323 CO: Men jeg tror Zabia de:t sådan som er mit indtryk hun e:r (.) .h
 324 ligeså Muslim som de fleste danskere er kristne
 325
 326 but I think Zabia tha:t as far as I understand she i:s (.) .h
 327 as much Muslim as most Danes are Christian
 328 (0.2)
 329 EM: ja:
 330 ye:s
 331 (0.5)
 332 EM: så du:
 333 so you:
 334
 335 CO: såh. hâh. hâh. [hâh heh. hâh. hâh. hâh. [.heh]
 336 soh. heh. heh. [heh heh. heh. heh. heh. [.heh]
 337 EM: [ja] [ja ja]
 338 [yes] [yes yes]
 339 CO: man er det men øh (0.3) men man er ikke følsom med det
 340 one is it but eh (0.3) but one is not sensitive about it
 341 (0.2)
 342 EM: *ne:j*
 343 *no:*
 344 (1.0)
 345 CO: ja men det jo sådan set det udmærket
 346 yes but that is then sort of all right

Here in line 323 CO makes a claim about IN, which works to diminish the relevance of the category of Muslims or at least downplays the assumed implications for her practices as an intern, because she makes a comparison between the candidate's ways of being Muslim with Danes' ways of being Christian. Although EM immediately displays understanding and confirmation of this comparison in line 329, CO elaborates and explains what is meant by it in 339, namely that IN belongs to a specific religious group but that she is not 'sensitive about the implications of this membership with respect to the practices it entails. After another quiet display of understanding and acknowledgement from EM and a one second pause indicating that none of the other participants have anything to add, CO decides that the issue is now finally settled and closes the topic by making the summarizing and evaluating statement in line 345 and in the following turn moving on to the topic of the internship agreement.

This example in this way differs from the previous one, where the participants were orienting to the employer's role of controlling the development of the interaction and thereby her right to close and initiate topics. Here, this right is claimed by the job-consultant. However, the job-consultant does not change topics till a point in the interaction where the employer has already illustrated her power to reintroduce the original issue of buying liquor and the job-

consultant has provided a response to this which is acknowledged and accepted by the employee. The job-consultant is in this way not disregarding or undermining the role and rights of the employer but can be said to be interpreting the various sides of and positions in the issue as adequately addressed and settled. Nevertheless, the fact that the job-consultant does not wait for a satisfied response from the employer shows that she considers the response of the employee as indicative of whether the issue has been satisfactorily solved. This may be related to the fact that it was the employee, who introduced the issue in the first place.

What is clear from this example and is made mostly explicit in this final part of the extract and in the job-consultant's utterance in line 281 in the previous part of the exchange is how the orientation towards religion as a relevant category in the internship interview is intimately linked to an orientation towards a differentiation between a Danish and a non-Danish 'way' of acting and being. Religion is made relevant in relation to a normative prescription of certain behaviours, positions and preferences that are outlined and defined as different from and in conflict with those characterized and established as common sense within a Danish context.

From the job-consultants utterance in line 281, 'fordi der er også mange danskere der ikke spiser svinekød' ('because there are also many Danes that don't eat- eat pork') it is clear that the category 'Danes' is made relevant as a common-sensical opposite to the previously established category of 'Muslims'. According to the description of MCD's presented by Sacks this shows that the participants orient to a social organization in which the category 'Muslim' not only makes sense as part of the MCD 'religious orientations' but is also given sense in relation to the MCD nationalities.

Or in other words, the fact that the category 'Danes' is made relevant and evoked in opposition to the category 'Muslims' reveals that the people considered members of the latter are not considered members of the former. The example in this way shows that a logic of differentiation and deferral is at work, which makes being Muslim equal to being non-Danish and makes Danish equal to being not-Muslim. This logic has the implication that as the candidate is associated with the category 'Muslims', she is simultaneously dissociated from the category 'Danes'. Her suitability for the future internship is hereby questioned on the grounds of not only her membership of the category 'Muslim' but her non-membership of the category 'Danes'.

5.5.1 Interpretative Repertoires Associating 'Religion' with 'Culture'

The interpretative repertoires activated and used by the participants in the negotiation of categories related to religion are very apparent and predominant since the participants not only explicitly expressed a range of assumptions related to religion but made these assumptions the actual objects of negotiation. Whereas the participants' orientations towards categories related to language, as illustrated in the previous section 5.4, were dominated by the topicalisation and negotiation of the language practices of the internship candidates, the orientations towards categories related to religion were dominated by negotiations about the religious practices of Muslims in general.

The establishment of categories related to religion was in this way much more explicit than in the orientation towards categories related to language. Neither in the orientations towards categories related to language nor in the orientations towards categories related to religion were explicit references made by the participants to specific categories such as 'second-language speakers' or 'Muslims' but in the latter case, a range of practices were explicitly referred to and discussed as 'religious practices'. The orientation towards and the establishment of the category 'Muslim' was in this way more explicit than the negotiation and establishment of categories such as 'second-language speaker' and 'second-language learner' and the assumptions and repertoires used in the process were for this reason much more explicitly expressed.

What was most apparent when considering the use of repertoires related to religion in the two examples analyzed was a pattern in the way different religious practices were considered as problematic and conflictual in relation to the practices and routines of a particular work-place. One could argue that this pattern has nothing to do with interpretative repertoires related to religion but rather to do with an individual's adaptation to the tasks and requirements of a specific work-place. However, I would argue, that the above analysis of the two examples shows that what is being negotiated is not whether the internship candidates in question will adapt to or perform a specific work-related practice but rather a general and potential conflict between a religious practice and a work-place.

As illustrated in the above analysis religion was topicalised by the employer or the employee inquiring about the position and behaviour of the internship candidate with regards to a specific religious practice, which is then presented as problematic in relation to a specific

practice in the work-place. The actual topicalisation is in this way informed by the assumption that a given religious practice is conflictual with a given work-practice, which is an assumption that is informed by the employers' previous experience and general understanding. What both examples reveal, however, is that the potential conflict foreseen by the employer is not solved or dismissed by the internship candidate's accommodation or agreement with the particular problem raised but is rather re-established and reproduced by the employer or the employee presenting additional assumptions and concerns. This reveals I would argue that the employer is not merely using previous experience of a religiously related conflict to address and solve a specific issue but rather is drawing on and formulating an entire interpretative repertoire of religious practices as conflictual with certain work-practices. This repertoire is characterized by the conflation and generalization of a range of practices as incompatible with religion and will be referred to as 'religion at work'.

In the first example analyzed above the participants co-construct the problem of the scarf as related to 'hygiene', 'physical interaction' and 'being professional' and these very different dimensions of work-related practices are conflated and oriented to as different sides of the same coin. In the second example the participants refer to problems in relation to 'buying liquor', 'pork' in general, 'buying sausages', 'pork and that kind of thing', 'chopping pork', 'eating pork', 'cutting pork' and 'buying two beers' and these are all constructed as synonymous examples of the same thing, namely a conflict between a religious practice and work-related practices. Again it should be noted that in both examples the participants continue the negotiation and orientation towards this conflict long after the internship candidates have acknowledged the specific problem raised and have acknowledged and solved the problem.

Another repertoire was predominant in both examples and was characterized by the unspecified formulation of and reference to a religious community as an absolute and coherent system of actions, beliefs and values and by various assumptions expressed about such actions, beliefs and values. Religion is in other words formulated as an entity that resemble traditional and commonsensical notions of 'culture' and as such this repertoire resembles the repertoire 'nationality-culture' that was described in relation to the section of the analysis focusing on how categories related to nationality was made relevant. It will therefore be referred to as the 'religion-culture' repertoire.

In the first example this repertoire was manifested in the following formulation by the employer 'I know that you have your various ways in which it is important to you that the

clothing should be' which is confirmed by the internship candidate. The two of them in this way, as described in the above analysis co-construct the category of 'Muslims' and associate it with a specific value in relation to clothing. This construction is based on the assumption that that a religious affiliation implies a certain system of values and actions and that this system of values is shared by all its members. In the second example the understanding of religion as a community of shared system of values and practices was slightly differently manifested.

Extract 36: Liquor and Pork (repeated extract)

144 EM: Og du har heller ikke noget imod at ehmm: du
 145 har ikke noget religiøse sådn- begrænsninger i forhold til at .h
 146 købe nogen varer vel?
 147
 148 And you don't mind either ehmm: you don't have any
 149 religious kind of- limitations in relation to buying some groceries
 150 right?
 151 (0.2)
 152 IN: mm nej
 153 mm no
 154
 155 EM: nej det godt
 156 no that's good
 157 (0.3)
 158 EM: Fordi vi havde nogen piger som sagt nej til at købe øhm: (0.4) .h
 159 spiritus 'for eksempel' >de ville ik de må- de- de måtte< ikke
 160 røre ved dem [(ja)]
 161
 162 Because we had some girls who said no to buying ehmm: (0.4) .h
 163 liquor for example >they would not they co- they- they could< not
 164 touch them [(yes)]
 165
 166 CO: [helle]r ikke flas[ker]
 167 [not] bottles eit[ther]
 168 IN: [heh.]
 169 (0.6)
 170 HO: nej=
 171 no=
 172 EM: =*n[ej*]
 173 =*n[no*]
 174 HO: [n]ej
 175 [n]o
 176 HO: vi har ogs- haft pro[blemer med] svinekød=
 177 we have als- had pro[blems with] pork=
 178 EM: [og de:]
 179 [and they:]
 180 EM: =ja: og [svine]kød de ville heller ikke købe nogen pøl[ser]
 181 =yes: and[por]k they would not buy any sausages ei[ther]
 182 CO: [okay]
 183 [okay]
 184 HO: [nej]
 185 [no]

First of all, the employee's initial question in line 144 'And you don't mind, you don't have any religious kind of limitations in relation to buying groceries' combined with the account in line 158 'because we had some girls who said no to buying alcohol...' establishes a category of people with religiously grounded limitations, practices and beliefs. These limitations, beliefs and practices are then, as illustrated in the analysis above, specified and discussed in the following part of the example as related to pork and alcohol.

The negotiations in the second example can generally be said to be informed by the ‘religion-culture’ repertoire, but they furthermore reveal other repertoires, some which are compatible with and support the ‘religion-culture’ repertoire and others that constitute its opposition. As argued in the interactional part of the analysis of how categories related to religion were made relevant the formulation in line 158, ‘they could not touch them ’, which was changed from ‘would not’, reflects an understanding of religious obligation which is informed by the repertoire of ‘religion-culture’. However, when considered in relation to some of the other definitions of religious practices such as ‘because one does not drink it one can still buy two beers for a client’ in line 308, ‘not bottles either’ in line 166, and the distinction made by the internship candidate between ‘not eating and not cutting pork’, the participants are co-constructing two different categories of Muslims. This process can be said to be informed by the repertoire ‘moderate Muslims’ and ‘radical Muslims’ where the latter is linked to the formerly mentioned ‘religion-culture’ repertoire.

The distinction between two ways of ‘being’ or ‘practicing’ ones religion can be seen as a way for the participant’s to deal with a conceptual dilemma between two contrary ideological positions regarding the relation between the individual and society. What is being negotiated in the two examples is how and whether the internship candidates’ religious practices and beliefs are compatible with the practices of a particular work-place, and the needs, interests and behaviour of the Danish clients served. This negotiation is informed by a dilemma between two contrary, but equally commonsensical principles of modern society: on the one hand, there is the individual right to have and practice religion, which is legally constituted through the Declaration of Human Rights. On the other hand, there are the democratic principles of the modern nation-state that comprise a range of rules that define and limit the exercising of such individual rights for the purpose of serving a common good. The negotiation of whether and how the internship candidate’s religious affiliation can be combined with a work-related context reflects the dilemma that these oppositional principles present.

In the first example (Extract 24: The Scarf), the influence of the contrary repertoires of ‘individual rights’ and ‘the interests of the community’ are reflected in the employer’s utterance in line 292 ‘I know that you have your various ways in which it is important to you that the clothing should be.’ This is formatted as a disclaimer for the demands she is presenting the internship candidate with. In the second example, these contrary repertoires are reflected in

EM's statement in line 191 to 206 in the extract above where she concludes that regardless of all their respect for different religious practices they cannot tell their clients to change their food preferences. EM hereby uses the repertoires 'individual right' and 'the interests of the community' to construct two different solutions to the conflict between 'religious practices' and 'work-related practices,' namely to either accommodate and respect the practice of the Muslim employee or the practice of the client and positions herself in relation to the two.

The analysis of the various repertoires in play in the topicalisation of religion shows how the negotiation of categories such as 'Muslims' and Muslim practices entails a negotiation of the category 'Danish' and Danish practices and vice versa. While the consistency rule accounts for how the mentioning of one category makes other categories within the MCD that this category belongs to relevant, it does not explain how orientations towards 'Muslims' entails orientations towards Danes. This can however be partially explained by the previously mentioned repertoire of 'religion-culture,' which implies that the association of the internship candidate with 'Islam' or 'Muslims' involves a simultaneous disassociation from 'Danes' and hereby, following the same logic, from 'Christians' or 'Protestants'.

5.5.2 Summary

This section of the analysis shows how categories related to religion are made relevant in relation to an inquiry and negotiation about whether a specific form of practice, such as wearing a hijab or buying alcohol, constitutes a potential problem for the tasks involved in the future internship. In the first example, this practice of wearing a hijab was specifically disassociated with religion by the use of neutral terms and by associating the issue of clothing with hygiene, personal contact and professionalism. In the second example, the practice of buying alcohol was explicitly associated with religion and linked to previous problems with other employees, but again a specific reference to Islam or Muslims is avoided and merely implied through the practices described.

The two examples are very similar in the way the topicalisation is initiated by a question from the employer or the employee about a specific practice which is responded to and potentially resolved by the internship candidate and accepted by the questioner. In both cases, this does not close the topic, which is on the contrary renewed and pursued at great length, driven by a range of different accounts supplied by the employer or the employee.

What is very clear from both examples is the role of the job-consultant in coming to the defence and being an advocate for the internship candidate, although they do so in different

ways and with different outcomes. In the first case, the job-consultant immediately contributes to the solving of the issue by emphasizing that the issue of clothing was well prepared, whereas in the second example, the job-consultant is more implicitly supporting the defence of the internship candidate by dissociating the candidate from more radical Muslims and associating her with Danes. She does this, however by probing the descriptions of Muslim practices co-constructed by the employer and the employee, and this leads a further prolonging of the topic. Furthermore, she uses the resource of humour, which on the one hand alleviates some of the tension and move the attention away from the internship candidate, but, on the other hand, once again prolongs the topic further. Finally, she also uses the defence technique used by the job-consultant in the first example, namely giving a more direct and explicit account or statement about the practice and values of the internship candidate, which counters the claims presented by the employer and the employee.

In both examples, the use of accounts is predominant and seems to have the function of legitimising the topicalisation of religion in the first place, as well as indirectly formulating a normatively prescribed behaviour that the internship candidate has to respond and relate to. These accounts produce extended negotiations about religion in both examples, and present the internship candidate and the job-consultant with various positions, claims and understandings that they have to respond to and refute in order to exhaust and close the topic. These extended sequences of claims and defences obviously take time and attention away from the competences and abilities of the internship candidate and delays any decisions and planning made with regards to the internship as such. This tendency is similar to what was observed and described in relation to the topicalisation of language.

As in the previous two analyses of orientations towards nationality and language, the analysis of orientations towards religion shows how the participant's orientations towards the participation framework and the distribution of rights associated with this interrelates with the orientations towards broader social categories such as Muslims. Thus, it was once again demonstrated that the job-consultant was acting in defence and on behalf of the internship candidate, and that HO is the one being granted and claiming the right to initiate and terminate the orientation towards the internship candidates' membership of a specific religious community. Such orientation towards the participation framework as described in section 2.2.1 informs and enables the orientations towards and negotiations of broader categories such as Muslims.

This interrelation suggests that the negotiation, assessment and admittance of the internship candidate depends not merely on the candidate's willingness to accommodate and change her way of dressing and her ability to communicate this willingness, but also on whether the employer decides that a specific problem raised has in fact been solved, which again depends on the outcome of the negotiations of various categories. Thus, the employer has a gatekeeping function; not only in having the power and right to decide whether or not the candidate will be offered the internship, but also in having the power and right to decide which topics are to be addressed during the interview and when they have been sufficiently covered and debated. In this interaction the priority and attention given to the topic of the scarf can be said to exceed what was projected by the original question posed by the employer and the following answer given by the candidate. Not to say that this is in itself extraordinary, but merely to suggest that the issue could potentially have been abandoned sooner, which would have allowed for an earlier return to other topics of relevance to the participants.

The negotiations about the meaning of the category 'Muslims' described within these two examples reveal the centrality of the various practices, beliefs and understandings associated with, and bound to, specific categories. Such negotiation over the categories as such and over which practices define the categories and membership hereof, illuminate that the participants are informed by and drawing on a dilemmatic common-sense and various ideological positions regarding issues of immigration, language, religion, learning and culture.

In the first example, the various accounts offered by the employer reproducing opposing common-places related to, on the one hand, the rights of the individual to have and practice a certain belief, and on the other, the rights of a community to decide and prescribe a certain practice. The hyper-accountability illustrated in this example can in this way be seen as an orientation towards the dilemma of accommodating conflicting interests and concerns, which is realized by using conventional interactional strategies and resources.

In the second example, the negotiations and accounts of the participants reflected a conceptual link between 'being Danish' and 'being Christian' which was associated with a range of specific practices that were constructed as commonsensical. These were distinguished from and disassociated with Muslims and Muslim practices, which were established as radical and illogical. The negotiation of Muslims and Muslim practices involved the constitution of and reference to 'a coherent and absolute system of beliefs and practices,' which manifested a

conceptual link between ‘religion’ and ‘culture’ that is similar to the link between ‘nationality’ and ‘culture’ which was described in the first analysis in section 5.3.

While the three different parts of the analysis have been separated for the sake of analytical overview and presentation, the different categorizations, repertoires as well as the actions and orientations of the participants in relation to nationality, language and religion were intertwined and closely related. This was reflected in the three different sections, in the way that negotiations of categories related to language involved negotiations of categories related to nationality, and categorizations related to religion involved categorizations related to nationality. This interrelatedness, or intersectionality, of various categories is, as previously argued in section 4.3.1, a fundamental premise for processes of meaning and social organization that involve the temporary establishment, as well as the continual renegotiation and redefinition, of categories and actions. The establishment of categories related to nationality, language and religion described above thus illuminate a temporary fixation of a process of actions, interpretations, categorizations, particularizations, repertoires, ideologies and common sense understandings that are both produced, negotiated, reproduced and challenged.

5.6 Gatekeeping in Internship Interviews – How the Negotiation, Establishment and Assessment of Nationality, Language and Religion Produces an Uneven Distribution of Rights, Knowledge and Status Between the Participants.

The negotiation, establishment and orientation towards categories related to nationality, language and religion are prevalent within the internship interviews studied in this thesis, and they involve the establishment of a system of relations between the categories established which is characterized by an uneven distribution of rights, knowledge and status between the members ascribed to these categories. The internship interviews thus reveal processes of gatekeeping, as defined in section 2.3.5, that are furthermore found to intertwine with and influence the practices of decision-making about the internship and the assessment of the internship candidate. In this section, I will compare and summarize the findings of the three sections of the analysis presented above in order to further illuminate and describe the system of relations between the participants that are produced in these gatekeeping processes.

What is found in the cases where the participants orient towards categories related to nationality as well as religion is that a specific ‘way’ of doing things within a Danish context is compared and distinguished from another way of doing things which is affiliated with the candidate. A system of relations is hereby established between the category ‘Danish’ and a range of other categories such as ‘Colombian’ and ‘Muslim.’ The former is characterized as the normative basis which the other categories are compared with and distinguished from. Furthermore, the behaviours, characteristics and practices attributed to the ‘other’ categories are described and evaluated as inferior, illogical and unreasonable in comparison with ‘Danish ways’. This was found not only in the words and formulations used to describe the practices associated with for example the category ‘Muslims’ and the category ‘Colombian,’ but in the implicit and explicit expression of the expectation that the candidate learn and adapt to ‘the Danish way’. The otherness of the candidate with respect to nationality or religion is thus considered as a barrier for the integration into a professional context, and the previous work-experience of the candidate is devalued and disregarded on grounds of its difference from ‘Danish’ work-related practices and values.

Gatekeeping processes related to orientations towards language are slightly different because they do not involve the establishment and opposition of different ‘ways’ and the

uneven distribution of rights, knowledge and status to participants associated with such ways. Rather, they are constituted in the orientation towards the language behaviour of some candidates as non-standard and in the implicit and explicit association of candidates with the category second-language, both of which establishes norm and deviance with respect to language behaviour and language membership. This was found in the checking of the candidate's understanding, in the suggestion that the candidate meet and talk with Danes and in the assumed link between being from Iran and having to learn Danish. In all cases, the language of the candidate is evaluated as non-standard and as something that potentially presents a barrier in the internship interview and the internship as such.

A social relations of power is thus established between the participants in which the 'Danishness' of some of the participants and the 'otherness' of the candidate involves an uneven distribution of knowledge, rights and status, which enables and legitimizes the demands made to the candidate with respect to future practices and behaviours.

In the first section of the analysis, such relations of power was manifested in relation to a negotiation of the Colombian kindergarten system compared to the Danish, and in the employer's characterization of a specific system of values and practices related to producing and selling crops at a Danish orchard.

In the second section of the analysis, it was reflected in the positive valorisation of speaking Danish well, in the encouragements made to meet Danes who speak Danish, and in the normative suggestions and prescriptions made regarding the language behaviour of the candidate in her private home.

In the third section of the analysis, it was identified in the negotiation of 'Muslim' practices and values in relation to 'Danish ways' where the former was established as problematic or incompatible with the latter. These four examples in various ways show the establishment of a system of relations between normative categories and practices versus deviant categories and practices; the candidate is immediately associated with the latter, and the other participants are associated with the former. This organization of categories and the social relations of power it establishes enable and legitimise the prescription of a certain behaviour for the candidate within and beyond the context of the internship interview.

What has been stated about the processes of gatekeeping in internship interviews seems to imply that gatekeeping is a simple process of category attribution in which the candidate is passively associated with a particular category by the other participants, especially by the

employer and the employee. This is, however, not the case. Gatekeeping is not an individual act, but a joint co-construction of a system of relations between categories which involves the production and reproduction of social relations of power. The membership categories and the development of the interactions are negotiated and co-constructed, but the participation framework grants certain rights to the employer with respect to initiating and closing topics, controlling the development of the interaction and making decisions about the internship. Although these rights are also co-constructed they affect the negotiation of membership categories and the topical development.

As the analysis shows, these processes of gatekeeping are not simple processes of category attribution in which the candidate is passively associated with a particular category by the other participants. Rather they constitute processes of negotiation over categories and category memberships, and in many cases the candidate ends up being associated with a category that is established as less different from the 'Danish' category than first assumed. This was the case in the 'Liquor and pork' example, the 'Colombia' example, and the 'Scarf' example, where the job-consultant and the candidate managed to negotiate the assumptions and categorizations of the employers and the employees. In the example from the orchard, these assumptions and categorizations were, however, left unchallenged and were not negotiated by the candidate. It was furthermore seen in relation to the orientations towards language where the presumptions made by the employers and employees about the language proficiency and the language membership of the candidate were challenged by the candidate as well as the job-consultants.

The result of the negotiations of and challenges to the categorizations made by the employers and employees is a more nuanced and complex axis of differentiation between the categories 'Danish culture' and 'other cultures,' or between 'Danish-speaker' and 'non-Danish-speaker.' This involves the establishment of categories in-between that are attributed with actions, practices and values similar to, although not equal to, those associated with the normative 'Danish culture'. This was clear in the 'Colombian' example, the 'Scarf example' and the 'Liquor and Pork' example, where the negotiation of the categories 'Colombia' and 'Muslim' in comparison with 'Danish' created a way of acting and behaving for the candidate within the realms of the attributed category membership that was compatible with 'Danish' ways. It was furthermore clear in the example with the woman from Iran not speaking Danish at home, where the suggested categorization of 'second-language learner' was negotiated and

changed to ‘second-language speaker’. In this manner, the processes of gatekeeping involved not only the distinction of ‘Danishness’ from ‘otherness,’ but the establishment of a scale of varying degrees of ‘otherness’ where some were established as superior, more sensible and compatible with ‘Danish ways’ than others.

Although gatekeeping processes involve the participation and co-construction of all the participants involved in an interaction, this does not imply an even distribution of rights to participate. The organization of a system of relations between categories and a relation of power between the participants both influence and are influenced by the distribution of rights between the participants that is associated with the participation framework.

As described in all three sections of the analysis, the rights of the employer and the employee allow the initiation and closing of topics which influences if, when, and for how long the participants orient to and negotiate categories related to nationality, language and religion. Furthermore, the employers have the right to make decisions about the future internship, and combined with their participant status as interviewers this influences the extent to which the topicalisations they make are challenged by the other participants. Similarly, the internship candidate’s participant status as interviewee and candidate influences the extent to which the categorizations made by the employer and the employee can be challenged and refuted. And finally, the participant status of the job-consultant as a mediator or an advocate for the internship candidate is manifested in the way that s/he assists the internship candidate in the negotiation of certain categorization either by supporting the challenges made by the internship candidate or by negotiating them on their behalf. The job-consultant is thus influential in finding alternative possibilities of categorization between the polarizations often established by the employers or employees, and such attempts often imply the prolonging of argumentation and category negotiation.

The participation framework of the internship interview thus intertwines with and supports processes of gatekeeping, but this is only on the level of decision-making and assessment. The gatekeeping processes, as they are defined in this thesis, were in the internship interviews studied not so much related to the employers’ participant status as decision-makers, but to the establishment of categories related to nationality, language and religion, and the dissociation of the employers from the candidates in relation to such categorization processes. Although such processes of categorization were, as described, co-constructed by the participants, the employers can be said to be the primary gatekeepers not because they were the

primary decision-makers but because they systematically claimed and were granted the primary right to define the category 'Danish' which formed the basis of all other categorization related to nationality, language and religion.

As argued and illustrated in the analysis processes of categorization and hereby processes of gatekeeping is a phenomenon which cannot be isolated from the cultural context of common sense within which it occurs. The assumptions and orientations of the participants with regards to categories such as 'Danish', 'non-Danish', 'Muslim' and 'Colombian' are informed by the membership knowledge of the participants and hereby by common sense and ideology. This is manifested in the patterns of interpretations and formulations in the utterances of the participants, as well as in the controversies over meaning and common sense. These together reveal certain structures of meaning and dilemmas of common sense regarding the categories that constitute the social world, the affiliation of members to such categories, and finally the practices, values, rights and obligations of such members.

The gatekeeping processes found within the internship interview are especially informed by meanings and common sense understandings related to nationality, language and religion and more broadly by various positions related to immigration and integration. These are manifested in the normative claims made by the employee and the employers in the example with the woman from Iran, where the behaviour of the candidate in the realm of the private home is explicitly prescribed and dictated. Such utterances reveal that what is being negotiated and evaluated is not merely the behaviour of the candidate as an interviewee or a future intern, but an immigrant and second language speaker in general.

The processes of gatekeeping revealing themselves in the internship interview have repercussions and implications beyond the context of the speech situation in the sense that they reflect and inform gatekeeping processes in other contexts and in society more broadly. If the assumptions, categorizations and social relations of power manifested in the internship interview are considered to inform and manifest common sense within a Danish context, then this implies a more wide-spread conceptualization of a discrepancy between the category 'Danish' categories such as 'second-language speaker' and 'Muslim'.

What I mean to highlight by introducing and applying the notion of gatekeeping in the analysis of internship interviews is that some processes of categorization in internship interviews, although not exclusively here, constitute and reflect a particular system of relations between categories and a social relation of power between the members of such categories

which involves an uneven distribution of rights, knowledge and status between participants. This is not an automatic or unavoidable outcome of processes of categorization as such, rather is it the outcome of a systematic pattern of categorization, and the systematic organization of certain categories in relation to each other which is found in some institutional interactions, such as the internship interview and is a potential outcome of any interaction in which this form of social organization is achieved.

There is yet another dimension of categorization which should be described in relation to gatekeeping, since it can be said to have a similar effect of implicitly and perhaps inadvertently disadvantaging some over others. While gatekeeping has so far been associated with the uneven distribution of rights affiliated with a particular system of relations between categories, it may also be viewed as an effect of particular systematically repeated processes of categorization, such as the repeated association and dissociation of people with specific categories such as 'Muslims', 'Danish' or 'second-language speaker' rather than alternative categories. As described previously, such processes in which people are distinguished and categorized in relation to ethnicity are described by Dennis Day with the term 'ethnification' (Day 1998). He defines this as *"processes through which people distinguish an individual or collection of individuals as a member or members respectively of an ethnic group."* While Day describes how ascriptions to specific ethnic groups such as Pakistani or Swedes presents a problem for the person being categorized, I wish to argue that any systematic categorization of a person in relation to one particular membership category rather than others is problematic in the sense that it potentially restricts processes of meaning and categorization and the range of possible interactional developments.

Processes of categorization always include the selection and foregrounding of some categories rather than others, and by foregrounding and orienting to some categories others are backgrounded and silenced. While the internship interviews reveal gatekeeping as previously defined, they also disclose the effect of such systematic foregrounding of some category membership rather than others. People can be categorized and ascribed to various different categories in various different contexts and by foregrounding and orienting to certain categories, behaviours or meanings others are backgrounded and silenced. While all interactions, including the internship interviews, offer many possibilities of categorization in relation to the age, the gender, the hair colour, the occupation and the educational background of the participants, the categorizations made reveal patterns in the foregrounding of some

categories and the backgrounding of others. Such patterns should be investigated and questioned, since they inform and reveal the structures of meaning and common sense that constitute our membership knowledge and in this way potentially constitute a barrier for alternative categorizations and meanings. Although the selection of categories and the organization of them in relation to other categories is informed by our membership knowledge and the common sense of a given time and place, such common sense is, as described in sections 3.3.2 and 4.5.7, controversial and hereby offers the possibility of alternative categorizations and meanings. As Billig describes, common sense contains the seeds for change.

Gatekeeping in the internship interviews can in this way be argued to be not only found in the establishment of a particular system of relation between categories and the uneven distribution of rights between the participants but to also be constituted by the systematic reproductions of and orientations towards some categories and memberships and the systematic backgrounding of alternative meanings and categories that this entails.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

This thesis has illuminated how processes of membership categorization are a central means by which we establish, orient to and organize ourselves and others in social interaction. Through the implicit and explicit orientation towards categories such as job-consultant, Danish, Muslim, Employer etc., the participants in interaction display which categories they consider relevant to the actions and activities they are engaging in. Thus, membership categorizations tie in with other verbal actions such as asking questions, giving responses and making claims and with interactional activities such as assessments, presenting oneself or a work-place, describing a legislative framework etc. In order for such actions and activities to be produced, recognized, understood and responded to in meaningful ways, the participants apply the common sense knowledge available to them as members of various flexible and interwoven communities of meaning, or cultures. Such cultures contain and produce conventionalized forms of interactional organization and behaviour as well as the structures of meaning and ideologies that make reality appear real.

These relations between the micro-dynamics of sense-making and broader structures of meaning have been illustrated and described as they manifest themselves in processes of categorization related to nationality, language and religion. It has been argued that categorizations of nationality, language and religion in the internship interviews studied imply processes of gatekeeping in the sense that they reveal a particular system of relations between these categories that involves an unequal distribution of rights, knowledge and status between the participants. The system of relations that is produced and reproduced in the categorization processes related to nationality, language and religion in these internship interviews are informed by structures of meaning and ideology available to the interlocutors through their participation in the internship interview as a particular speech situation and in the culture(s) that this speech situation makes relevant and brings into play. These cultures range from the small-scale organizational cultures associated with a particular work-place such as an Orchard, a residential home or a kindergarten to the large-scale cultures associated with a particular country such as Denmark, Iran or Colombia or the middle-scale cultures associated with a particular bureaucratic or institutional system such as the job-counselling programs, the municipal jobcentre or the language schools.

Throughout the various internship interviews the participants would establish and negotiate their individual memberships of these different cultures through their membership categorizations and through their use of interpretative repertoires, which had the effect of socially organizing the participants in relation to one another. What the analysis of the processes of categorization related to nationality, language and religion revealed was a systematic process of differentiation and dissociation of the internship candidates from 'Danish culture', which was assumed to define the practices and norms of a range of other communities and categories that the internship candidate was affiliated with.

In other words, the internship candidate's non-Danishness, or the foreignness, was central to the processes of membership categorization involved in the internship interviews, which were in turn intimately tied to processes of gatekeeping and resulted in the tendency of an unequal distribution of rights, knowledge and status between the participants. This pattern of inequality between the participants was reinforced by the participants' orientations towards the participation framework, which granted the employers and the job-consultants the principal right to initiate and close topics and thereby project a certain direction and development of the interactions.

Combined with the systematic processes of differentiation and dissociation of the internship candidates from 'Danish ways', the internship interviews at times presented a great challenge for the internship candidates in the sense that they had to respond to, account for and defend themselves against a variety of categorizations that questioned their qualifications, competences or suitability to a particular work-place or work-function.

As suggested in the presentation of the broader context of the internship interview, one might argue that the continual orientation towards the 'foreignness' and 'non-Danishness' of the internship candidate with respect to nationality, language and religion is related to the establishment and context of the speech situation. Although it was not possible to systematically examine the processes of planning and establishing the internship interviews that preceded them, it is likely that this process has influenced the participants' mutual expectations to the speech situation.

The internship candidates were all except one participating in job-counselling programs focusing on people who were born abroad and spoke Danish as a second-language, but the criteria of referral to these programs were neither clearly nor unanimously defined as related to the nationality, language or religion of the participants. Rather, what seemed to explain the

referral of the internship candidates to these specific job-counselling programs was the general and underlying assumption that being an immigrant or a refugee naturally implied certain difficulties in getting a job – an assumption that is arguably supported by Danish statistics of unemployment. Regardless of whether the internship candidates' classification as a particular type or class of unemployed was explicitly formulated in the establishment and planning of the internship interview, it is likely that the different national or linguistic background of the candidates was at some point mentioned.

Such prior contextualization of the speech situation may account for the widespread and repeated orientations towards the otherness of the internship candidates, but it does not account for the specific realizations of such orientation or the concrete logics of differentiation at stake. The patterns of ways of orienting towards the otherness of the internship candidates manifest the participants' application of various structures of meaning and ideology that have specific realizations and consequences within the context of the internship interview but have possible implications beyond this context as well.

In this thesis, it has been proposed that the combination of the conversation analytical method of membership categorization analysis and the discursive psychological analysis of interpretative repertoires enables such examination. It has been demonstrated how each analytical perspective, although closely related and in some respects overlapping, allow descriptions of different dimensions of the shared cultural knowledge that participants apply in processes of sense-making and social organization. This thesis has focused on one specific speech situation, namely the internship interview, and illustrated how processes of meaning and social organization constitute social relations that systematically involve an unequal distribution of rights, knowledge and status between the participants. A few comments should, however, be made with regards to the more wide-ranging possible implications of the structures of meaning identified in the internship interview.

Consider the example with the woman from Somalia wearing a hijab, where the woman is associated with the category Muslim, which in turn is differentiated with and dissociated from the category 'Danish' and Danish practices and norms. One might argue that this orientation towards the otherness of the woman is 'commonsensical' within the context of the speech situation, since one of the goals of this interaction is to establish whether the internship candidate is capable of and suitable for an internship, and the issue of the scarf might be a potential problem in this regard. One might also argue that the orientation towards the

otherness of the woman is commonsensical irrespective of any specific work-related problems with the scarf, because the scarf constitutes a religious symbol that displays an affiliation with a religious ideology that is different from Danish 'ways', practices and norms. These are the two logics of differentiation (re)presented by the employer in this specific example.

The purpose of this thesis is not to contest the commonsense expressed by the participants, but to illuminate and describe what is formulated and accepted as commonsensical and what is not. The underlying hope and ambition has been to inspire and encourage reflection on the implications of such ideological status quo for the social organization and distribution of power in society. Is the logic of differentiation and dissociation between Muslims and Danes necessarily commonsensical, and what are its implications for the social organization and social distribution of power, rights and possibilities between the members of such categories? What does it say about Danish society and the Danish labour-market that this logic of differentiation is formulated and accepted as commonsensical? How is the goal of integration through employment to be met, if the people who are expected to integrate are Muslims and hereby naturally considered incompatible with Danish work-related practices and norms? These questions have not been addressed explicitly in this thesis but they implicitly and forcefully present themselves from the findings presented and will hopefully inspire further discussion and reflection.

English Summary

Gatekeeping at Work – The Negotiation, Establishment and Assessment of Nationality, Language and Religion in Internship Interviews

This thesis examines 16 audio recordings of internship interviews between ethnically Danish employers and born abroad refugees and immigrants. The internship interviews are all established within the framework of various public job-counselling programs and are facilitated by the assigned job-consultants. The internship interviews analysed in this thesis include both the *introductory* and the *follow-up* interviews.

Combining a conversation analytical and discursive psychological perspective, the author investigates how the participants negotiate, establish and assess membership categories related to nationality, language and religion. Moreover, the analysis demonstrates how this negotiation is informed by and manifests certain interpretative patterns. The detailed level of analysis furthermore uncovers how the participants' orientation towards nationality, language and religion produces a particular organisation of the participants characterized by a systematically uneven distribution of rights, knowledge and status. The principle of this systematic organisation is described through the notion of Gatekeeping, introduced from the field of interactional sociolinguistics.

The contribution of the thesis is at once empirical, methodological and theoretical: Firstly, the thesis seeks to contribute to the existing body of research within institutional and/or 'intercultural' interactions by presenting empirical material drawn from the context of internship interviews. Secondly, the author seeks to formulate a theoretical conceptualization of culture as interactionally produced communities of meaning, which supplements and specifies the ethnomethodological understanding of shared knowledge. Finally, the thesis is an interdisciplinary methodological endeavour combining a conversation analytical micro-perspective and a broader discursive psychological and poststructuralist perspective on structures of meaning, ideology and power-relations. The thesis formulates a socialconstructionist perspective, which is realized in the conversation analytical deconstruction of social categories and in the more general critical exploration of theoretical and methodological categorizations.

Dansk Resumé

Dørvogtning i Arbejde – Forhandlingen, Etableringen og Vurderingen af Nationalitet, Sprog og Religion i Praktiksamtaler

Afhandlingens omdrejningspunkt er båndoptagelser af 16 praktiksamtaler mellem danske arbejdsgivere og ledige indvandrere og flygtninge, der i forbindelse med forskellige jobsøgningsforløb søger en praktikplads. I samtalen deltager også en jobkonsulent, som skal hjælpe den ledige i beskæftigelse og i den forbindelse assistere etableringen af praktikken. De praktiksamtaler, som analyseres i denne afhandling udgør henholdsvis de *indledende* og *opfølgende* interviews, som knytter sig til praktikken.

Igennem kombinationen af et samtaleanalytisk og diskurspsykologisk perspektiv belyses samtaledelegaternes forhandling, etablering og vurdering af medlemskategorier relateret til nationalitet, sprog og religion og de fortolkningsmæssige mønstre, som manifesterer sig i og influerer denne forhandling. Analysen beskriver, hvordan delegaternes orientering mod nationalitet, sprog og religion producerer en organisering af samtaledelegaterne i forhold til hinanden som er kendetegnet ved en systematisk ulige fordeling af rettigheder, viden og status. Denne systematik beskrives i forhold til begrebet dørvogtning (gatekeeping) som hentes fra den interaktionelle sociolingvistik.

Afhandlingens erkendelsesinteresse er både af empirisk, metodisk og teoretisk karakter: Først og fremmest udgør afhandlingen et bidrag til den eksisterende forskning indenfor institutionelle og/eller 'interkulturelle' samtaler. Samtidig formulerer afhandlingen en teoretisk konceptualisering af kultur som interaktionelt producerede og genererede betydningsfællesskaber, der supplerer og nuancerer den etnometodologiske ide om delt viden. Sidst men ikke mindst udgør afhandlingen et tværvidenskabeligt metodisk bud på en kombination af et samtaleanalytisk mikro-perspektiv og et bredere diskurspsykologisk og poststrukturalistisk perspektiv på betydningsstrukturer, ideologi og magtrelationer. Afhandlingens overordnede ærinde er således socialkonstruktionistisk, hvilket udmønter sig ikke blot i den samtaleanalytiske dekonstruktion af sociale kategorier men i en mere overordnet udforskning og udfordring af teoretiske og metodiske kategoriseringer.

Appendix 1: Legal extracts

Extract 1: Lov om integration af udlændinge i Danmark

Kapitel 4

Introduktionsprogrammet

§ 23. Udlændinge, der i medfør af kapitel 5 er berettiget til introduktionsydelse, skal af kommunalbestyrelsen tilbydes aktivering. Aktiveringen tilrettelægges i overensstemmelse med den enkelte udlændings handlingsplan, jf. § 19.

Stk. 2. Aktivering kan omfatte en eller flere af følgende typer aktiviteter:

- 1) Kortvarige vejlednings- og introduktionsprogrammer med vejledning om arbejds- og uddannelsesmuligheder og med adgang til at afprøve beskæftigelsesønsker.
- 2) Virksomhedspraktik, herunder individuel jobtræning, jf. §§ 22 og 24 i lov om en aktiv arbejdsmarkedspolitik, hos private og offentlige arbejdsgivere.
- 3) Særligt tilrettelagte uddannelsesaktiviteter.
- 4) Særligt tilrettelagte aktiverende forløb i form af vejlednings- og praktikforløb, erhvervsmodnende kurser eller andre tilsvarende forløb med en kombination af arbejde og uddannelse.
- 5) Frivillige og ulønnede aktiviteter efter udlændingens eget ønske, som kommunalbestyrelsen anser for at have samfundsmæssig betydning eller betydning for den pågældendes uddannelses- eller arbejdsmæssige situation.
- 6) Voksen- eller efteruddannelse efter udlændingens eget ønske, som er omfattet af de regler om uddannelser, hvortil der kan opnås uddannelsesgodtgørelse og orlov til uddannelse (positivlisten), som arbejdsministeren fastsætter i medfør af § 27, stk. 1, i lov om en aktiv arbejdsmarkedspolitik og § 3, stk. 2, i lov om orlov.

(1998:Chapter 4, § 23)

Extract 2: Lov om en aktiv beskæftigelsesindsats

Kapitel 11

Virksomhedspraktik

§ 42. Personer, der er omfattet af § 2, nr. 1-5, og som enten har behov for en afklaring af beskæftigelsesmål, eller som på grund af mangelfulde faglige, sproglige eller sociale kompetencer kun vanskeligt kan opnå beskæftigelse på normale løn- og arbejdsvilkår eller med løntilskud, kan få tilbud om virksomhedspraktik på en offentlig eller privat virksomhed.

Stk. 2. Personer, der er omfattet af § 2, nr. 7, og som modtager ledighedsydelse eller særlig ydelse efter §§ 74 og 74 i efter lov om aktiv socialpolitik, kan få tilbud om virksomhedspraktik med henblik på afprøvning af personens rådighed, jf. lov om aktiv socialpolitik §§ 74 b, 74 c, 74 g og 74 i.

Stk. 3. Tilbuddet gives med henblik på at afdække eller optræne personens faglige, sociale eller sproglige kompetencer samt at afklare beskæftigelsesmål.

(2003bChapter 11, § 42)

Extract 3: Bekendtgørelse af Udlændingeloven

- 2) i de sidste 3 år forud for meddelelsen af tidsubegrænset opholdstilladelse har været fast tilknyttet arbejdsmarkedet som lønmodtager eller selvstændig erhvervsdrivende her i landet og må antages fortsat at være dette,
- 3) i de sidste 3 år forud for meddelelsen af tidsubegrænset opholdstilladelse ikke har modtaget anden hjælp efter lov om aktiv socialpolitik eller integrationsloven end hjælp bestående af enkeltstående ydelser af mindre beløbsmæssig størrelse, der ikke er direkte relateret til forsørgelse, eller ydelser, der må sidestilles med løn eller pension eller træder i stedet herfor, og
- 4) har opnået en væsentlig tilknytning til det danske samfund.

(2008bChapter 1, § 11, Stk. 4)

Extract 4: Bekendtgørelse af Udlændingeloven

Stk. 9. Medmindre særlige grunde taler derimod, er meddelelse af tidsubegrænset opholdstilladelse betinget af, at udlændingen

- 1) har gennemført et tilbudt introduktionsprogramme efter integrationsloven eller, hvis det ikke er tilfældet, har gennemført et andet forløb, der kan sidestilles hermed, jf. stk. 11,
- 2) har gennemført fastlagte aktiviteter i henhold til § 31 a i lov om en aktiv beskæftigelsesindsats, jf. stk. 11,
- 3) har bestået en af ministeren for flygtninge, indvandrere og integration godkendt danskprøve, jf. stk. 11, og
- 4) ikke har forfalden gæld til det offentlige, jf. stk. 11.

(2008bChapter 1, § 11, Stk. 9)

Extract 5: Lov om Danskuddannelse til Voksne Udlændinge m.fl.

§ 1. Formålet med uddannelse i dansk som andetsprog (danskuddannelse) er at bidrage til, at voksne udlændinge med udgangspunkt i deres individuelle forudsætninger og integrationsmål opnår nødvendige dansksproglige kompetencer og viden om kultur- og samfundsforhold i Danmark, så de kan blive deltagende og ydende medborgere på lige fod med samfundets øvrige borgere.

Stk. 2. Danskuddannelse skal bidrage til, at voksne udlændinge så hurtigt som muligt efter at have fået opholdstilladelse i Danmark tilegner sig færdigheder i at forstå og anvende det danske sprog og opnå kendskab til det danske arbejdsmarked, så de herved får mulighed for at komme i beskæftigelse og bliver i stand til at forsørge sig selv.

Stk. 3. Danskuddannelse skal endvidere fremme voksne udlændinges aktive brug af det danske sprog samt bidrage til, at de opnår almene kundskaber og færdigheder, som er relevante i forhold til arbejde og uddannelse samt livet som medborger i et demokratisk samfund.

(2003a)

Appendix 2: Transcription notations³⁷

(.)	Just noticeable pause or micro-pause (less than 0.2 seconds)
(2.6)	Pauses timed in seconds
[ja] ok	Square brackets aligned across adjacent lines denote overlapping talk
[nå]	denotes overlapping talk
hh.	In-breath
hh	Out-breath
ja-	Dash denotes sharp cut-off
wha:t	Colon denotes extension or stretching of the preceding sound
(word)	Brackets around words denotes a guess at what might have been said if unclear
ja=	Equal sign denotes that there is no discernible pause between two
=nå	speakers' turns or, if put between two sounds within a single speaker's turns, shows that they run together
<u>word</u>	Underlined sounds are stressed
WORD	Words or sounds in capitals are spoken in loud voice
°word°	Material between "degree signs" is spoken in low voice
>word<	Inwards arrows show faster speech
<word>	Outwards arrows show slower speech
£word£	Material between pound signs are spoken in "smile" voice
word?	Question mark denotes an upward 'question' intonation
word.	The full stop indicates a 'sentence-ending' intonation
word,	The comma denotes a 'continuing' trajectory, that indicates that the person has more to say
↑word	Upwards arrow denotes a rising intonation

³⁷ The following transcription notations are a simplified and selective version of the transcription conventions developed by Gail Jefferson as described by Atkinson & Heritage and Hutchby & Wooffitt (Atkinson & Heritage 1984; Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998)

Bibliography

1993. Lov om en aktiv arbejdsmarkedspolitik. 434: www.retsinfo.dk
1998. Lov om integration af udlændinge i Danmark (Integrationslov). 474: www.retsinfo.dk
- 2003a. Lov om danskuddannelse til voksne udlændinge m.fl. 375: www.retsinfo.dk
- 2003b. Lov om en aktiv beskæftigelsesindsats. 419: www.retsinfo.dk
- 2005a. Bekendtgørelse af lov om en aktiv socialpolitik. 1009: www.retsinfo.dk
- 2005b. Lov om ansvaret for og styringen af en aktiv socialpolitik. 522: www.retsinfo.dk
- 2006a. Bekendtgørelse af lov om integration af udlændinge i Danmark (integrationsloven). 902: www.retsinfo.dk
- 2006b. Cirkulæreskrivelse om naturalisation. 9: www.retsinfo.dk
- 2007a. Bekendtgørelse af lov om en aktiv beskæftigelsesindsats. 1074: www.retsinfo.dk
- 2007b. Bekendtgørelse af lov om integration af udlændinge i Danmark (integrationsloven). 1593: www.retsinfo.dk
- 2008a. Bekendtgørelse af lov om en aktiv beskæftigelsesindsats. 439: www.retsinfo.dk
- 2008b. Bekendtgørelse af Udlændingeloven. 808: www.retsinfo.dk
- Adelswärd, Viveka (1988). *Styles of succes: on impression management as collaborative action in job interviews*. Linköping: University of Linköping.
- Adelswärd, Viveka (1992). Interviewer styles - on interactive strategies in professional interviews. In J. Wagner and A. Grindsted (eds.), *Communication for specific purposes. Fachsprachliche Kommunikation*. 143-163. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Akinnaso, F. N. and Seabrook Ajirrotutu, C. (1982). Performance and Ethnic Style in Job Interviews. In John Gumperz (ed.), *Language and Social Identity* 119-144. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Anderson, Benedict (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. (1983) London: Verso.
- Antaki, Charles (1994). *Explaining and Arguing: The Social Organization of Accounts*. London: Sage.
- Antaki, Charles and Wetherell, Margaret (1999). Show concessions. *Discourse Studies* 1, 7-27.
- Antaki, Charles, Barnes, Rebecca and Leudar, Ivan (2005). Diagnostic formulations in psychotherapy. *Discourse Studies* 7, 627-47.
- Antaki, Charles and Widdicombe, Sue (eds.) (1998a). *Identities in Talk*. London: Sage Publications.
- Antaki, Charles and Widdicombe, Sue (1998b). Identity as an Achievement and as a Tool. In Charles Antaki and Sue Widdicombe (eds.), *Identities in Talk* 1-14. London: Sage Publications.
- Atkinson, J. Maxwell and Heritage, John (1984). *The Structure of Social Action. Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, Peter (1998). Learning how to play the game: An investigation of role-played job interviews in East Germany. *Text* 18, 7-38.
- Auer, Peter and Kern, Friederike (2001). Three ways of analysing communication between East and West Germans as intercultural communication In A. Di Luzio, S. Günthner and F. Orletti (eds.), *Culture in communication: analyses of intercultural situations* 89-116. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Austin, John (1962). *How To Do Things With Words*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). Discourse in the novel. In Michael Holquist (ed.), *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin* 259-422. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Barth, Fredrik (1966). *Models of Social Organization*. London: Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland.
- Barth, Fredrik (1998a). Introduction. In Fredrik Barth (ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The social Organization of Culture Difference* 9-38. Long Grove, Illinois: Waveland Press.
- Barth, Fredrik (1998b). Pathan Identity and Its Maintenance. In Fredrik Barth (ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Culture Difference* 117-134. Long Grove, Illinois: Waveland Press.
- Barth, Fredrik (1998c). Preface. In Fredrik Barth (ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The social organization of Culture Difference* 5-7. Long Grove, Illinois: Waveland Press.
- Barthes, Roland (1957). *Mythologies*. Paris: Éditions Du Seuil.
- Bauman, Zygmunt (1973). *Culture as Praxis: Monographs in Social Theory*. London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Baumann, Gerd (1999). *The Multicultural Riddle. Rethinking National, Ethnic, and Religious Identities*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Billig, Michael (1987). *Arguing and Thinking: a rhetorical approach to social psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Billig, Michael (1991). *Ideology and opinions. Studies in rhetorical psychology*. London: SAGE.
- Billig, Michael (1996). *Arguing and Thinking: a rhetorical approach to social psychology*. (1987) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Billig, Michael (1999a). Conversation Analysis and the claims of naivety. *Discourse & Society* 10, 572-576.
- Billig, Michael (1999b). Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in Conversation Analysis. *Discourse & Society* 10, 543-582.
- Bremer, Katharina, Roberts, Celia, Vasseur, Marie-Thérèse, Simonot, Margaret and Broeder, Peter (1996). *Achieving Understanding*. London: Longman.
- Brown, Annie (2003). Interviewer variation and the co-construction of speaking proficiency. *Language Testing* 20, 1-25.
- Campbell, Sarah and Roberts, Celia (2007). Migration, ethnicity and competing discourses in the job interview: synthesizing the institutional and personal *Discourse & Society* 18, 243-271.
- Carbin, Maria and Tornhill, Sofie (2004). Interseksjonalitet - et oanvändbart begrepp? *Kvinnovetenskaplig Tidskrift* 3, 111-114.
- Clifford, James (1992). Travelling cultures. In Lawrence Grossberg, C. Nelson and P. Treichler (eds.), *Cultural Studies* 96-116. London: Routledge.
- Collins, P. H. (1998). "It's all in the family". Intersections of gender, race, and nation. . *Hypatia* 13, 62-82.
- Day, Dennis (1994). Tang's dilemma and other problems: ethnification processes at some multicultural workplaces. *Pragmatics* 4, 315-336.
- Day, Dennis (1998). Being Ascribed, and Resisting, Membership of an Ethnic Group. In Charles Antaki and Sue Widdicombe (eds.), *Identities in Talk* 151-171. London: Sage.
- Day, Dennis (2006). Ethnic and social groups and their linguistic categorization. In Kristin Buehrig and Jan ten Thie (eds.), *Beyond Misunderstanding, the linguistic analysis of intercultural discourse* 217-244. The Hague, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Day, Dennis (2008). In another 'messo' context. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40, 979-996.
- Derrida, Jacques (1972). *La différance*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
- Derrida, Jacques (2002). *Differance*. (1972) Frederiksberg: Det lille Forlag.

- Drew, Paul (2003). Comparative Analysis of Talk-in-Interaction in Different Institutional Settings: A Sketch. In Phillip Glen, Curtis D. LeBaron and Jenny Mandelbaum (eds.), *Studies in Language and Social Interaction* 293-308. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Drew, Paul and Heritage, John (1992a). Analysing talk at work: an introduction. In Paul Drew and John Heritage (eds.), *Talk at Work: interaction in institutional settings* 3-65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, Paul and Heritage, John (eds.) (1992b). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eckert, Penelope (2005). Variation, convention and social meaning. *Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America* 1-33. Stanford University.
- Edwards, Derek (1997). *Discourse and Cognition*. London: Sage.
- Edwards, Derek and Potter, Jonathan (1992). *Discursive psychology*. London: Sage Publications.
- Erickson, Frederick and Schultz, Jeffrey (1982). *The Counselor as Gatekeeper: Social interaction in interviews*. New York: Academic Press.
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland (2002). *Ethnicity and Nationalism. Anthropological Perspectives: Anthropology, Culture & Society*. London, Sterling, Virginia: Pluto Press.
- Fairclough, Norman (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis - the critical study of language*. New York: Longman.
- Festinger, L (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations* 7, 117-40.
- Firth, Alan (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 6, 237-59.
- Fogtman, Christina (2007). Samtaler med politiet. *Department of Nordic Languages* Copenhagen: Copenhagen University.
- Foucault, Michel (1977). *Discipline and Punish*. London: Tavistock.
- Foucault, Michel (1978). *The History of Sexuality*. Harmondsworth: Allen Lane, Penguin Books.
- Foucault, Michel (1980). *Power/Knowledge*. Brighton: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Gardner, Roy and Wagner, Johannes (2004). *Second Language Conversations. Studies of Communication in Everyday Settings*. London: Continuum.
- Garfinkel, Harold (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Garfinkel, Harold and Sacks, Harvey (1970). On Formal Structures of Practical Actions. In J.C. McKinney and E.A. Tiryakian (eds.), *Theoretical Sociology* 337-66. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Gergen, Kenneth J. (1991). *The saturated self. Dilemmas of identity in contemporary life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gergen, Kenneth J. (1994). *Realities and relationships. Soundings in social construction*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Gergen, Kenneth J. (2001). *Social Construction in Context*. London: Sage.
- Goffman, Erving (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goodwin, Charles and Duranti, Alessandro (1994). Introduction. In Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking context. Language as an interactive phenomenon* 1-42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gramsci, Antonio (1971). *Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Grossberg, Lawrence (1996). Identity and Cultural Studies - Is That All Their Is? In Stuart Hall and Paul Du Gay (eds.), *Questions on Cultural Identity* 87-107. London: Sage.

- Gumperz, John J. (1962). Types of linguistic communities. *Anthropological Linguistics* 4, 28-40.
- Gumperz, John J. (1964). Linguistic and Social Interaction in Two Communities. *American anthropologist* 66, 137-153.
- Gumperz, John J. (1972). Introduction. In John Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics. The ethnography of Communication* 1-25. USA: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Gumperz, John J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, John J. (2001). Contextualisation and ideology in intercultural communication. In A. Di Luzio, S. Günthner and F. Orletti (eds.), *Culture in communication: analyses of intercultural situations* 35-53. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Gumperz, John J. and Hymes, Dell (eds.) (1972). *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. USA: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Gumperz, John J., Roberts, C. and Jupp, T. C (1979). *Crosstalk: a study of cross-cultural communication*. London: National Centre for Industrial Language Training in association with BBC.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1985). 'Modernity - an incomplete project'. In Hal Foster (ed.), *Postmodern Culture* 3-15. London: Pluto Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1987). *The philosophical discourse of modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hall, Stuart (1997). The Spectacle of the Other. In Margaret Wetherell, Stephanie Taylor and Simeon J. Yates (eds.), *Discourse Theory and Practice - a Reader* 324-344. London: Sage Publications.
- Hamburger, Charlotte (1989). *Assimilation eller integration?: dansk indvandrerpolicy og tyrkiske kvinder*. Århus: Politica.
- Hamburger, Charlotte (1990). Assimilation som et grundtræk i dansk indvandrerpolicy. *Politica* 22, 306-18.
- Hanks, William (1990). *Referential practice: language and lived space among the Maya*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hannerz, Ulf (1992). *Cultural Complexity. Studies in the social organization of meaning*. New York: Colombia University Press.
- Harris, Roxy (2006). *New ethnicities and language use*. London: Palgrave.
- Hastrup, Kirsten (2004). *Kultur - det fleksible fællesskab*. Århus: Århus Universitetsforlag.
- Hebdige, Dick (1984). *Subculture: The meaning of style*. New York: Methuen.
- Hepburn, Alexa and Wiggins, Sally (2005). Developments in Discursive Psychology. *Discourse & Society* 16, 595-601.
- Heritage, John (1984a). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, John (1984b). *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Heritage, John (2006). Oh-Prefaced Responses to Inquiry. In Paul Drew and John Heritage (eds.), *Conversation Analysis* 311-361. London: Sage.
- Heritage, John and Watson, D.R. (1979). Formulations as conversational objects. In George Psathas (ed.), *Everyday Language. Studies in Ethnomethodology* (1979) 123-162. New York: Irvington.
- Hester, Stephen and Eglin, Peter (eds.) (1997a). *Culture in Action. Studies in Membership Categorisation Analysis*. Washington D.C.: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America.

- Hester, Stephen and Eglin, Peter (1997b). Membership Categorization Analysis: An Introduction. In Stephen Hester and Peter Eglin (eds.), *Culture in Action. Studies in Membership Categorization Analysis* 1-25. Washington D.C.: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America.
- Hester, Stephen and Eglin, Peter (1997c). The Reflexive Constitution of Category, Predicate and Context. In Stephen Hester and Peter Eglin (eds.), *Culture in Action. Studies in Membership Categorization Analysis* 25-49. Washington D.C.: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America.
- Hjarnø, Jan (1990). Indvandernes situation på det danske arbejdsmarked: Strukturændringernes og stereotypierne onde cirkel. *Politica* 22, 320-31.
- Holquist, Michael (ed.) (1981). *The dialogic Imagination. Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Hutchby, Ian and Wooffitt, Robin (1998). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hymes, Dell H. (1964). Introduction: Toward Ethnographies of Communication. *American anthropologist* 66, 1-34.
- Hymes, Dell H. (1971). The Ethnography of Speaking. In Thomas Gladwin and William C. Sturtevant (eds.), *Anthropology and Human Behaviour* (1962) 13-53. Washington D.C.: Anthropological Society of Washington.
- Hymes, Dell H. (1972). Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life. In John Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics. The ethnography of Communication* 35-71. USA: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Hymes, Dell H. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics. An Ethnographic Approach*. London: Tavistock.
- Integrationsenhed, Københavns Kommunes og MHTConsult (2005). Fra Chauffør til AC'er. 1-54. København: Københavns Kommune og MHTConsult.
- Jupp, T. C, Roberts, C. and Cook-Gumperz, J. (1982). Language and disadvantage: the hidden process. In John J. Gumperz (ed.), *Language and social identity* 232-256. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kjærbeck, Susanne (1998a). Den etnometodologiske konversationsanalyse som kulturanalytisk metode. *Hermes* 20, 139-163.
- Kjærbeck, Susanne (1998b). En undersøgelse af diskursorganisation i danske og mexikanske forhandlinger: turn-taking og struktur i diskursenheder. *Copenhagen Working Papers in LSP* 5, 1-222.
- Kjærbeck, Susanne (2003). Hvad er en vellykket aktiveringssamtale?: En undersøgelse af myndiggørelse og umyndiggørelse i handleplanssamtaler In Birte Asmuss and Jakob Steensig (eds.), *Samtalen på arbejde: konversationsanalyse og kompetenceudvikling* 213-233. Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur.
- Kjærbeck, Susanne (2005). Analyse af kulturel identitet: Etniske repræsentanter - når alt kommer til alt? In Susanne Kjærbeck (ed.), *Samtaleanalyse : Konstruktion og forhandling af identitet* 31-48. Roskilde Universitetscenter.
- Kjørup, Søren (1997). *Forskning og samfund*. København: Nordisk Forlag A/S.
- Kramsch, Claire (1998). *Language and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Labov, William (1982). *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Lave, Jean and Wenger, Etienne (1991). *Situated Learning. Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Levinson, Stephen C. (1992). Activity types and language. In Paul Drew and John Heritage (eds.), *Talk at Work. Interaction in Institutional Settings* 66-100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liep, John and Olwig, Karen Fog (1994). *Komplekse liv. Kulturel mangfoldighed i Danmark*. København: Akademisk Forlag.
- Lykke, Nina (2003). Intersektionalitet - ett användbart begrepp för genusforskningen. *Kvinnovetenskaplig Tidskrift* 1, 47-56.
- Matejka, Ladislav and I.R.Titunik (1973). Translators' Introduction. In V.N.Volosinov (ed.), *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* 1-6. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mazeland, Harrie and Berenst, Jan (2006). Sorting Pupils in a Report-Card Meeting. Categorization in a Situated Activity System. *Text and Talk* 28, 55-78.
- Miles, Robert (1989). *Racism*. London: Routledge.
- Milroy, Lesley (1980). *Language and Social Networks*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Moerman, Michael (1988). *Talking culture: ethnography and conversation analysis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Mondada, Lorenza (2004). Ways of 'Doing Being Plurilingual' in International Work Meetings. In Rod Gardner and Johannes Wagner (eds.), *Second Language Conversations* 18-39. London: Continuum.
- Nielsen, Mie Femø (2002). Nå! En skiftemarkør med mange funktioner. In Kjeld Kristensen (ed.), *Studier i Nordisk 2000-2001. Selskab for Nordisk Filologi. Foredrag og årsberetning* 51-67. København: Selskab for Nordisk Filologi.
- Nielsen, Mie Femø, Steensig, Jakob and Wagner, Johannes (2005). Konversationsanalyse i Danmark.
- Nielsen, Søren Beck and Nielsen, Mie Femø (2005). *Samtaleanalyse*. Fredriksberg: Forlaget Samfundslitteratur.
- Pike, Kenneth (1967). *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior*. (1954) The Hague: Mouton.
- Pomerantz, Anita (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J.M.Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis* 152-63. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, Anita (1986). Extreme case formulations: a way of legitimizing claims. *Human Studies* 9, 219-29.
- Potter, Jonathan (1996). *Representing reality: discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. London: Sage.
- Potter, Jonathan (2005). Making psychology relevant. *Discourse & Society* 16, 739-747.
- Potter, Jonathan and Wetherell, Margaret (1987). *Discourse and social psychology. Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage Publications.
- Psathas, George (1995). *Conversation Analysis. The study of Talk-in-Interaction*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Rampton, Ben (1999). Sociolinguistics and Cultural Studies: New ethnicities, liminality and interaction. *Social Semiotics* 9, 355-374.
- Rampton, Ben (2003). Hegemony, social class and stylisation. *Pragmatics* 13, 49-84.
- Rampton, Ben (2005). Late modernity and social class: The view from sociolinguistics. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies* 1-11. London.
- Rampton, Ben (2006). *Language in late modernity interaction in an urban school*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Rampton, Ben, Harris, Roxy and Small, Lauren (2006). The Meanings of Ethnicity in Discursive Interaction: Some Data and Interpretations from Ethnographic Sociolinguistics. *ESRC Identities and Social Action Programme* 1-14. London.
- Rasmussen, Gitte (1997). Interkulturel kommunikation - begreber og metoder. *RASK* 7, 101-130.
- Rezaei, Shahamak (2005). Det duale arbejdsmarked i et velfærdsstatsligt perspektiv - et studie af dilemmaet mellem uformel økonomisk praksis og indvandreres socioøkonomiske integration. 287. Roskilde: Roskilde Universitet.
- Risager, Karen (2006). *Language and Culture. Global Flows and Local Complexity*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Risager, Karen (2008). Nyankommen i Danmark. In Michael Svendsen Pedersen and Hartmut Haberland (eds.), *Sprogliv - Sprachleben. Festschrift - Festschrift. Karen Sonne Jakobsen 60 år* 109-122. Roskilde: Institut for Kultur og Identitet: Roskilde Universitetscenter.
- Risager, Karen (forthcoming). Tolken i det interkulturelle forskningsinterview. *Kult.*
- Roberts, C. and Campbell, Sarah (2005). Fitting stories into boxes: Rhetorical and Textual Constraints on candidates' performances in British job-Interviews. *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 2, 45-74.
- Roberts, C. and Campbell, Sarah (Forthcoming). Fitting stories into boxes: Rhetorical and Textual Constraints on Candidates' Performances in British Job-Interviews. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*.
- Roberts, C., Moss, B., Wass, V., Sarangi, S. and Jones, R. (2005). Misunderstandings: a qualitative study of primary care consultations in multilingual settings, and educational implications. *Medical Education* 39, 465-475.
- Roberts, C., Moss, Becky, Wass, Valerie, Sarangi, Srikant and Jones, Roger (2003). Patients with Limited English and Doctors in General Practice: Educational Issues.
- Roberts, C. and Sarangi, S. (1999a). The dynamics of interactional and institutional orders in work-related settings. In C. Roberts and S. Sarangi (eds.), *Talk, Work and Institutional Order: Discourse in medical, mediation and management settings* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Roberts, C. and Sarangi, S. (eds.) (1999b). *Talk, Work and Institutional Order: Discourse in medical, mediation and management settings*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Roberts, C. and Sarangi, S. (2005). Theme-oriented discourse analysis of medical encounters. *Medical Education* 39, 632-640.
- Roberts, Celia and Campbell, Sarah (2006). *Talk on Trial: job-interviews, language and ethnicity*. Leeds: Corporate Document Services.
- Roberts, Celia, Davies, Evelyn and Jupp, Tom (1992). *Language and discrimination: a study of communication in multi-ethnic workplaces*. London: Longman.
- Roberts, Celia and Sarangi, Srikant (1999c). Hybridity in gatekeeping discourse: Issues of practical relevance for the researcher. In C. Roberts and S. Sarangi (eds.), *Talk, Work and Institutional Order* 473-503. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Roberts, Celia, Sarangi, Srikant and Moss, Becky (2004). Presentation of self and symptoms in primary care consultations involving patients from non-English speaking backgrounds. *Communication and Medicine* 11, 159-170.
- Sacks, Harvey (1972a). An Initial Investigation of the Usability of Conversational Data for Doing Sociology. In D. Sudnow (ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction* 31-74. New York: The Free Press.

- Sacks, Harvey (1972b). On the Analyzability of stories by children. In John Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics* 329-345. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Sacks, Harvey (1992a). Lecture 6. The MIR Membership Categorization Device. In Gail Jefferson (ed.), *Lectures on Conversation* 40-48. Cambridge: Blackwell
- Sacks, Harvey (1992b). Lecture 8 'We;' Category-bound activities. In Gail Jefferson (ed.), *Lectures on conversation* Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Sacks, Harvey (1995). Lecture 8 'We;' Category-bound activities, Spring 1966. In Gail Jefferson (ed.), *Lectures on conversation* (1992) 333-340. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Sacks, Harvey, Schegloff, Emanuel A. and Jefferson, Gail (1974). A simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-taking for Conversation. *Language* 50, 696-735.
- Sarangi, S. and Roberts, C. (1999). The dynamics of interactional and institutional orders. In S. Sarangi and C. Roberts (eds.), *Talk, Work and Institutional Order* 1-57. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist* 70, 1075-95.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1980). Preliminaries to Preliminaries: "Can I ask You a Question". *Sociological Inquiry* 50, 104-53.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: some uses of "uh huh" and other things that come between sentences. In Deborah Tannen (ed.), *Analyzing Text and Talk* 71-93. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1992). On talk and its institutional occasions. In Paul Drew and John Heritage (eds.), *Talk at work. Interaction in institutional settings* 101-34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1994). In another context. In Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking context. Language as an interactive phenomenon* 191-228. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1997). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse & Society* 8, 165-187.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1998). Reply to Wetherell. *Discourse & Society* 9, 413-416.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1999). Naivete vs sophistication or discipline vs. self-indulgence: a rejoinder to billig. *Discourse Society* 10, 577-582.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2007). A Tutorial on Membership Categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39, 462-482.
- Schegloff, E.A. and Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica* 7, 289-327.
- Scheuer, Jan (2001). Recontextualization and Communicative Styles in Job Interviews. *Discourse Studies* 3, 223-248.
- Scollon, Ron and Scollon, S. Wong (2001). *Intercultural Communication. A Discourse Approach* Malden, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Shotter, John and Gergen, Kenneth J. (1989). *Texts of identity*. London: Sage.
- Speer, Susan A. and Parsons, Ceri (2006). Gatekeeping Gender: Some Features of the Use of Hypothetical Questions in the Psychiatric Assessment of Transsexual Patients. *Discourse and Society* 17, 785-812.
- Speer, Susan A. and Parsons, Ceri (2007). 'Suppose you couldn't go any further with treatment, what would you do?' Hypothetical questions in interactions between psychiatrists and transsexual patients. In A. Hepburn and S. Wiggins (eds.), *Discursive Research in Practice: New Approaches to Psychology and Interaction* 182-200. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Statistik, Danmarks (2007). Indvandreres beskæftigelse er øget. *NYT*.

- Staunæs, Dorte (2003). Where have all the subjects gone? Bringing together the concepts of intersectionality and subjectification. *NORA* 11, 101-10.
- Steenisig, Jakob (2001). *Sprog i Virkeligheden*. Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag.
- Stokoe, Elizabeth and Edwards, Derek (2007). 'Black this, black that': racial insults and reported speech in neighbour complaints and police interrogations. *Discourse & Society* 18, 337-72.
- Stokoe, Elizabeth and Hepburn, Alexa (2005). 'You can hear a lot through the walls': Noise formulations in neighbour complaints. *Discourse & Society* 16, 647-73.
- Street, Brian (1993). Culture is a verb: Anthropological aspects of language and cultural process. In D. Graddol, L. Thomson and M. Byram (eds.), *Language and Culture* 23-43. Clevedon: Baal and Multilingual Matters.
- Sundberg, Gunlög (2004). *Asymetrier og samförstånd i rekryteringssamtal med andraspråkstalare*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Svennevig, Jan (2001). Institutional and conversational modes of talk in bureaucratic consultations. In A. Hvenekilde and J. Nortier (eds.), *Meetings at the crossroads. Studies of multiculturalism and multilingualism in Oslo and Utrecht* 106-135. Oslo: Novus.
- Svennevig, Jan (2004). Other-repetition as display of hearing, understanding and emotional stance. *Discourse Studies* 6, 489-516.
- Svennevig, Jan (2005). Repetisjon og reformulering som forståelsesstrategier i andrespråkssamtaler. . In S et al. Lie (ed.), *MONS 10 Utvalde artikler frå det tiande Møte om norsk språk I Kristiansand 2003* Kristiansand: Høyskoleforlaget.
- Tajfel, Henri (1981). *Human Groups and Social Categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trads, Søren Frimann (2000). *Interpersonelle Relationer i Medarbejdersamtaler*. Aalborg: Aalborg Universitetsforlag.
- Turner, J and Giles, H (1981). *Intergroup Behaviour*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tylor, Edward B (1871). *Primitive Culture*. London: John Murray.
- Vološinov, V.N. (1929). Author's Introduction. In V.N. Vološinov (ed.), *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* xiii-xviii. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Vološinov, V.N. (1973). *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wagner, Johannes (2006). Læring og Integration. *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Andrespråksforskning* 1, 89-104.
- Watson, Rod (1997). Some General Reflections on 'Categorization' and 'Sequence' in the Analysis of Conversation. In Stephen Hester and Peter Eglin (eds.), *Culture in Action: studies in Membership Categorization Analysis* 49-75. Washington D.C.: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America.
- Wenger, Etienne (1999). *Communities of Practice. Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wetherell, Margaret (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society* 9, 387-412.
- Wetherell, Margaret (2005). Methods for studying Multiple Identities: Intersectionality, Practice and Troubled and Untroubled Subject Positions. *Methods in Dialogue - ESRC Seminar Series* 1-11. Cambridge.

- Wetherell, Margaret and Potter, Jonathan (1988). Discourse analysis and the identification of interpretative repertoires. In Charles Antaki (ed.), *Analysing everyday explanation* 168-184. London: Sage.
- Wetherell, Margaret and Potter, Jonathan (1992). *Mapping the language of racism*. Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Wooffitt, Robin (2005). *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis. A comparative and Critical Introduction*. London: Sage Publications.
- Zimmerman, Don H. (1998). Identity, Context and Interaction. In Charles Antaki and Sue Widdicombe (eds.), *Identities in Talk* 87-106. London: Sage.